UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.

LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XIX APRIL 1948 No. 4

GREAT IDEAS

[Lucius Seneca, the Roman philosopher and dramatist, died by the orders of the tyrant Nero on the 12th of April, 65 A. D. We bring together some of his sayings appropriately for this month.—ED.]

A good spirit and intention is open to all men; in this we are all noble: neither doth Philosophy reject or elect any man, but shineth unto all.

It is dangerous for a man too suddenly or too easily to believe himself. Wherefore let us examine, watch, observe, and inspect our own hearts, for we ourselves are our own greatest flatterers. We should every night call ourselves to an account.

Every man has a judge and a witness within himself of all good and ill that he does, which inspires us with great thoughts, and administers to us wholesome counsels. To see a man fearless in dangers, untainted with lusts, happy in adversity, composed in a tumult, and laughing at all those things which are generally either coveted or feared—all men must acknowledge that this can be nothing else but a beam of divinity that influences a mortal body.

There is no condition of life that excludes a wise man from discharging his duty. If his fortune be good, he tempers it; if bad, he masters it; if he has an estate, he will exercise his virtue in plenty; if none, in poverty.

Wisdom is a right understanding, a faculty of discerning good from evil, what is to be chosen and what rejected; a judgment grounded upon the value of things, and not the common opinion of them.... Wisdom does not teach our fingers but our minds, and instructs us not in the instruments but in the government of life, that we may not only live, but live happily....She allows nothing to be good that will not be so for ever; no man to be happy, but he that needs no other happiness than what he has within himself; no man to be great or powerful that is not master of himself. This is the felicity of human life, a felicity that can neither be corrupted nor extinguished.

NON-VIOLENCE THROUGH THE AGES

[This able study of the antecedents of non-violence and of the problems which confront its advocates today is by **Shri Kishorlal G. Mashruwala,** long associated closely with its chief exponent in the modern world. Shri Mashruwala has himself served as President of the Gandhi Seva Sangha, an association devoted to the service which he recognises as the necessary positive application of non-violence. This paper was prepared before the assassination of Gandhiji. —ED.]

The cult of non-violence is probably much older than Buddha and Mahavira. But as I have no clear conception of the exact shape in which the principle of non-violence was worked out and popularised before their time, I take these as my starting-points.

Non-violence—Ahimsa—is in appearance a negative term. Violence being the result of an activity—a positive movement—non-violence, by itself, is abandonment of such activity and no more. That I refrain from injuring some life does not by itself mean that I should love it or do anything to serve or help it in its struggle for existence, or even to save it from death or other injury from an extraneous cause. The extent to which the negativeness of the principle is emphasised will be seen from the following quotation :—

Suppose a person is distributing corn among famine-stricken people and the distributor asks a votary of *Ahimsa* as to what he thinks of his action. Whether it is meritorious or sinful?... Lord Mahavira has specifically instructed that a votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent on such occasions. He should not say that it is a meritorious act because it is his duty to see that he does not consent to the killing of any being whether moving or not moving. Similarly he should not say that the act is sinful because he would then be instrumental in preventing the distribution of alms to the hungry people. Those who praise the gift are accessory to the killing of corn life. Those who forbid it deprive others of the means of subsistence. A votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent and save himself from being exposed to sin either way.[1]

The idea of non-violence, however, could not have originated in man's mind but on account of previous wide-spread habits of violence in the society in which he lived. One of these was meat-eating. Generally man has been a meat-eater and thousands of animals are slaughtered every day to provide him with meat. In the past, he offered meat to his gods also. It was looked upon as a religious and sacred act. Necessarily people possessing greater religiousness or riches or position in the State killed more life than ordinary men by way of offerings to gods

[1] *The Cult of Ahimsa.* By SREE CHAND RAMPURIA, p. 41.

or celebration of festivals or both. And so we read in the Puranas stories of kings who had become famous for their extraordinary "religious sense," *i.e.*, for having killed innumerable animals through hundreds of sacrificial functions.

So no wonder that, in a country like India, thinkers arose who were repelled by this wanton destruction of life. They could not stand killing—at least not in the name of religion. They recognised that meat-eating was not absolutely necessary for healthy existence in India. Perhaps the opposite was more true.

Then, while meat-eating was probably common to all classes of people —Aryans as well as Adivasis—killing for sacrificial purposes seems to have been essentially a part of the Vedic religion. It is very improbable that neither Buddha nor Mahavira was brought up in the Vedic religion. The sacrifice-cult did not appeal to them and Buddha, at any rate, vigorously preached against it. He did not—perhaps could not—condemn meat-eating altogether, but he protested against taking life for sacrificial purposes and also advised moderation in meat diet. He set apart certain days when no meat was to be taken. Not having laid much stress on vegetarianism, Buddhists as such have hardly been vegetarians altogether. But, with the spread of Buddhism, animal sacrifices declined and almost disappeared from some parts of India. Though Buddhism itself disappeared from India, the revised edition of the Vedic religion could not fully revive the sacrifice-cult. With Vedic religion itself, Vaishnavism and other sects arose which substituted vegetable offerings in place of animal ones and set their faces strongly against the latter.

But probably by this time the teachings of Mahavira had also spread side by side with Buddhism. It is doubtful whether the early Jains in the time of Mahavira were strict vegetarians. But in course of time Jainism evolved this aspect of non-violence in a very definite manner. It made an intensive study of various types of life with the purpose of evolving habits of life and a dietary which would give the utmost expression to non-violence in action. It made vegetarianism a practicable proposition and broke large numbers of men—not recluses—into that habit. Vegetarianism became a pledge of Jainism, and for all practical purposes *Ahimsa* got confined to the non-killing of the tiniest visible animal life, and abstention from all animal food and even several kinds of vegetable food.

Vaishnavism took a middle attitude between Buddhism and Jainism. It accepted to a very large extent the creed of not killing animal life for either religious sacrifice or food. But it did not accept all the injunctions of the Jains in respect of vegetable food and Vaishnavas generally fully partook of all the edible things of the vegetable kingdom.

The growth of the sentiment of non-violence presupposes the devel-

opment to a certain extent of the sentiments of friendliness (*maitri*) and compassion (*karuna* or *anukampa*). It is the growth of these which makes the doctrine or cult of non-violence acceptable to men and not the other way about. So, along with the negative side of non-violence, some of its positive aspects necessarily developed and showed themselves in individual or organised acts of friendliness and compassion towards the dumb creation. Thus *go-raksha* (saving the cow from the slaughter-house), *panjrapol* (maintenance of indigent animals), feeding monkeys, stray dogs, ants, fish and even lice, bugs, etc., became commendable acts. Though there might be a lack of sense of proportion and crudeness in these practices, they nevertheless show how the spirit of friendliness and compassion towards mute life expressed itself in an active manner amongst the followers of these faiths.

Of these the sentiment of *go-raksha,—i.e.*, that the cow should not be slaughtered even as an offering to the gods and certainly not for food—became in course of time the universal creed of India, even the Parsis and perhaps the pre-European Christians and several Muslim individuals and states also respecting it. Though the Vedic religion after its revival restored several animal sacrifices, the cow and the bull became non-sacrificeable and non-eatable for all. With regard to the killing of other animals and the taking of animal food, the followers of the Vedas were divided into two main branches: vegetarians and non-vegetarians. Though the latter have always been in the majority, the former have been a substantial and influential part of Hindu India.

This may be briefly regarded as the net result of the organised efforts of Buddhism and Jainism, modified by Vedism, for the spread of non-violence.

The teachings of Buddhism also contained positive aspects of non-violence, that is, deeds of friendliness and compassion. The Buddhist literature has several stories to illustrate this aspect. But it does not appear that this side of non-violence was worked out in practice to any appreciable extent in an organised manner, at any rate in India. The world is indebted to Christianity for developing this aspect of non-violence.

Along with religious preaching, Christ's practical life, it seems, was also dedicated to the service of suffering humanity. He served the morally diseased man by preaching and the physically diseased one by nursing and healing. The New Testament loves to consign the latter service to miracles. But that is in keeping with religious biographies. Jesus must have also served them as ordinary doctors and nurses do, through medicinal and other treatment known to him and by attending to their special needs during illness. For, if it had been miracles only, this side of human service, which is a speciality of the Christian

missionaries, could hardly have become a permanent feature of the Christian world. Several great teachers and saints all over the world have been credited with the power of healing by miracles. But their followers are not known to have taken to the service of the sick as a part of their faith.

While I say this I am also aware that there have been bigoted Christian priests who have declared strongly against other modes of treatment and, during their period of power, even punished those resorting to them. Nevertheless, these services have always formed part of the Christian *sādhanā*, and there has been an unbroken line of pious men and women who have dedicated their lives to these services and organised them in an exemplary manner. They have also been liberally patronised by Christian laymen of all ranks, countries and churches. Thus organised implementation of non-violence in the shape of service of humanity suffering from ignorance, wretchedness and disease has been the speciality of Christianity.

Islam did not lay much stress upon the principle of non-violence as such. But that does not mean that it has made no contribution to the evolution of non-violence. It was perhaps Islam that first drew attention to the violence prevailing in society in the form of exploitation of man by man. Though it did not preach equality or Socialism, as we understand these terms at present, namely, as something inconsistent with Capitalism, vested interests, class privileges, totalitarian power, etc., it was the first to advocate abolition of slavery and usury and to insist upon equality of rank in several religious and social matters. It also laid emphasis on alms and institutions for orphans and the poor. The abolition of usury is perhaps its particular contribution and it stands in contrast with Judaism and Hinduism in this respect.

Though not connected directly with a religious movement, the age of science which began in Europe after Luther and advanced by leaps and bounds during the last century and a half has also contributed to the evolution of non-violence in a new direction. It consists in search for and application of the least painful methods of executing acts where injury is inevitable. The injury itself might be deliberate violence—as in capital punishment or in slaughter of animals for food or in vivisection. But a sentiment has developed seeking to make the execution swift and painless. This sentiment also accounts for the use of anæsthetics in surgery. Indeed, the sentiment often expresses itself even in the handling of vegetable life.

On the one hand, the scientific age has increased the volume and intensity of violence hundreds of times more than ever before and has made man almost callous and unthinking. On the other hand, it has made him extremely sensible of suffering and painstaking in trying to reduce all avoidable pain.

Socialism following in the wake of the age of science and industries has also contributed to the promotion of a very important and neglected aspect of non-violence. It would be comparatively easy to distinguish between violence and non-violence if they were confined to physical injury only. But subtle injury in the form of various types of exploitation of man by man is difficult to detect and control. Like meat-eating itself, several other violent habits have been taken as unavoidable ever since man began to live in society. Deeper thinking has shown that the assumptions are groundless. Socialism must be credited with drawing pointed attention to these types of violence and creating an almost world-wide opinion against institutions conducive to exploitation. It has not remained confined to the realm of theory, but has demonstrated itself to a certain extent in actual practice by creating institutions and States based on Socialistic ideas. This too is an organised aspect of non-violence.

Then we come to our own period. Gandhiji, the greatest apostle of non-violence since Christ, is the first to have proclaimed that non-violence is not only a principle or doctrine of mainly negative import, but that it is a dynamic force capable of being harnessed and applied like any other physical or spiritual force. He also declared that Truth and Non-violence (indeed, several other spiritual principles also) were inseparable from one another. Though he retains the negative term "Non-violence" in preference to the positive Christian terms Faith, Hope and Charity, or the Buddhist terms Friendliness and Compassion, still by coupling it with what he has called the Constructive Programme, he has given it a concrete positive import. The items and the method of the working out of the Constructive Programme will vary according to the needs and times of the people concerned. The important thing is to realise that non-violence will not take deep root unless it is translated into acts of service, in forms like those illustrated in the Constructive Programme, and that the sphere of activities is not confined to any particular department of life. Every human activity and problem—whether for convenience called religious, social, economic, political, literary, or other—has a violent as well as a non-violent way of achieving its purpose. Gandhiji insists upon the non-violent method.

Though this may be regarded as the general aspect of his doctrine, the particular problems which he has had to face during the past half century have been mainly the reform of our political, social and industrial institutions, and the resistance to injustice in these spheres inflicted by the strong and organised sections of humanity upon the weak and unorganised sections. In these fields he created a technique whereby the weakest could resist the strongest by strict adherence to non-violence only. It is true that, in the circumstances in which he has been obliged to work, he has had to put up with

adulterations by violent acts also in almost all his programmes. The adulterations were against his wishes and according to him were responsible for the activities not coming out as successfully as they would have done if they had remained purely non-violent. Whether the specific items of Gandhiji's Constructive Programme remain as they are for all time to come or not and whether those that remain keep within the limitations he has fixed for them or get altered, I believe that the technique of Satyagraha evolved by him for resisting injustice, and the necessity of coupling it with some form of constructive service, are features that will always endure.

The achievement of India's independence, such as it is, is a permanent proof of the success of non-violence as well as, according to him, of its unsatisfactory elements caused by violence adulterating it. But the modern age has brought into the limelight two of the ugliest forms of violence. The first is war. Wars there always have been. But the last two world wars have beaten all previous records in their ghastliness and extent. War is international violence. The second ugly form of violence is the intra-national warfare. It is subtler than the former, being neither fully organised nor unorganised. This form of human conflict has also been there always. But the scale on which it has burst out in our times is unprecedented.

The first world war set several profound people thinking, and there came into being a group of Pacifists. Though at the time of the second great war some of them lost their faith and became reconverts to violence, several still adhered to the non-violent creed. Nor is there a dearth of people who want intra-national warfare to stop. But, in spite of the will, we are still in search of an effective way of ending both types of warfare and a non-violent method not only of solving the problems which are responsible for inspiring violence, but also of non-violently resisting such violence, when it bursts. No doubt it will be through loving service and organised non-violent constructive activities that a technique of making the war-monger and the strife-sower ineffective will be found. Such should find no audience and no following. People should get convinced that they should have nothing to do with violence, whether against another nation or against another section of their own countrymen, whether for political, economic, religious or any other cause, and they should know how to organise themselves to resist effectively in a non-violent manner all forcible attempts to make them fight or contribute their share to a fight, or to make them surrender to injustice or to acts of violence.

The right method of achieving this has still to be made clear. It is still a somewhat virgin field of non-violence. It now forms part of Gandhiji's latest mission. Though the way is not quite clear yet, it

may get clear at any moment. Meanwhile, let us prayerfully plod on through service and non-participation in retaliatory violence. Let us also hope that Gandhiji will be spared to us to show the way to overcome this suicidal urge to violence, as he showed the way to an India which, in the early years of this century, was despairing of becoming independent and oscillating between spasmodic outbursts of violence and constitutional agitation.

K. G. MASHRUWALA

ANCIENT INDIA

How India enriched the ancient world by her thought and culture is well brought out once more by Shri Kanwal Kishan, who writes on "Greater India in the Ancient World" in *Perspective*, Vol. II, No. 4. He contrasts interestingly the nature of India's contacts with the West and with the East. The cultural conquest far overshadowed trade relations in Central Asia and to the eastward, though trade drew many Indians to the South-East. But, perhaps in obedience to the law of supply and demand, the emphasis in early Indo-Western relations was throughout more on commerce than on culture, although the Buddhist missions of Asoka left their lasting impressions on Western Asian Countries and on Egypt. Greater India was not an empire in the political sense. To Tibet, China, and to South-East Asia India carried her message.

India's cultural and colonial expansion achieved its culmination in the colonisation of Malaya, Indo-China and the entire Indian archipelago. The result was not the imposition of a superior upon a primitive culture, but a synthesis of the pristine Indian culture with the indigenous type. Shri Kanwal Kishan says in conclusion that it is "the noble Stupa of Borobudur" in Java,

> enshrining within its thousand splendid riches, the Immortal Apostle of Ahimsa, which remains to this day the eternal symbol of India's cultural and colonial expansion in the ancient world.

It may well be that now a new impulse will spread from modern India, an impulse given by the life and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, calling men back to the remembrance of forgotten values and of the puissance of human brotherhood to cure all the world's ills.

THE GANDHIAN ERA

[**Prof. N. A. Nikam, M.A.**, of the Maharani's College, Bangalore, whose contribution on " The Limitations of Non-Violence " appeared in our Correspondence columns in October 1947, brings out here the highest aspect of Non-Violence, attained by Gandhiji before he triumphed over death. It would be a portent and a promise of the triumph of good over evil, though almost more than we deserve, if indeed our era could go down to history as the Gandhian Era, instead of as the Era of the Atomic Bomb. Which it shall be depends in large part on the earnestness with which his teachings are studied and applied. —ED.]

Now that Gandhiji has been removed from our midst by an act of violence, I want to bring together in the pages of The ARYAN PATH, as my humble tribute to his immortal memory, what I perceive to be two stages in the development of the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence. For I suppose that hereafter we shall go to Gandhiji's writings and search them for guidance even more than we have done before.

In Gandhiji's doctrine of non-violence the later stage, transcending and even negating the earlier, seemed, at any rate while he lived, a little far from our comprehension. I do not mean that Gandhiji was himself unaware of the second and later stage, nor do I mean that it was an accidental development. For he had said long ago :

...I have never presented to India that extreme form of non-violence, if only because I do not regard myself fit enough to deliver that ancient message. Though my intellect has fully understood and grasped it, it has not as yet become part of my whole being. My strength lies in my asking people to do nothing that I have not tried repeatedly in my own life. (*Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi.* Fourth edition, p. 971).

I think that Gandhiji presented to India, and not to India only, the " extreme form of non-violence " in his Delhi Fast ; those who had watched the Calcutta Fast might have seen what was coming but even so its swiftness took us unawares. We had followed with ease and with enthusiasm the earlier form of non-violence, right from its beginnings in South Africa, and without a murmur we had hailed him as the apostle of non-violence. Even the earlier form of non-violence had undergone a change from " passive resistance " to " non-violent resistance, " a subtle distinction. We did not object. We learned under his guidance to make the necessary adjustment because the earlier form and doctrine of non-violence meant *resistance* (though non-violent) ; its motto was : " Take what is yours. " And we took what was ours. But the second, " the extreme form of non-violence " puzzled us and even caused resentment, for it meant *non-*

resistance, and that in an absolute sense. Its motto was: "Give what is yours," demanding from us such generosity and love as were in *his* heart. I suppose that, at the time of his Delhi Fast, he considered himself "fit enough to deliver that ancient message"; but we had tarried on the way and had failed to catch up with him.

It is not that he was "ahead" of events, but that he alone saw events in their correct sequence. For it is as clear as daylight that we must live in an absolute sense, *i. e.*, as "one world," or, not at all. Science has, in its own way, led us to this absolute truth which we have all perceived and so we cannot pretend to be strangers to absolute values.

That the "extreme form of non-violence" seems to negate and contradict the earlier and more "likeable" form is true; but this is the way in which our great teachings have come down to us: by being first affirmed and then negated. So it is said in the *Kena Upaniṣad: Tadeva Brahma Tvam Viddhi*: Know That as Brahman (know that only as Brahman which is an object of *intellect* and not of sense; or, as Plato would have put it: Know Brahman as "idea," for to Plato an "idea" is known only and is not an object of sense).

But it is added immediately: *Nedam Yadidam Upasathe*: (No, no, not that which you *think*, because, you will think Brahman an object, whereas its true nature is that it is Subject and not object.) And so the Gandhian teaching is neither cowardice nor violence but non-violent resistance; not even this, for, *non-violence is non-resistance.* This is the transcendental part of his doctrine.

Let it not be said that Gandhiji "mixed up" politics and religion and that his politics placed Religion in danger. If he did mix up the two it was to make of politics, which Plato called a "degrading occupation," a religion, expecting the politician so to act as if he were in the "divine presence," *i.e.*, as a man of true religion would do. It is those who differed from him that mixed up religion and politics, *i. e.*, made their respective religions, their politics.

A great soul lives more fully after his death than during his bodily existence. And he lives by generating compassion in the hearts of men, so that they may live in an absolute sense; for without compassion this is impossible. This brings me to reflect upon the quality of that act which showed the "limitlessness," if you like, of violence and the proof—which is what the sceptics amongst us were wanting—of the validity of Non-violence, which alone is Truth. And thus we are ushered into the Gandhian Era; the era in which, I fancy, Hindus and Muslims will kneel in reverence together on the banks of the Jamuna, as it winds its course through eternity, symbolising Humanity's Sorrow.

N. A. NIKAM

WHITMAN AND THE ORIENT

[**Professor Emory Holloway** is a well-known biographer of his great compatriot, and has brought out two editions of *Leaves of Grass*. His *Whitman: An Interpretation in Narrative* was a Pulitzer Prize book. He brings out here how firmly Whitman, the glorifier of the possibilities of the new world, was rooted in the assurances of the old. Whitman intuitively perceived the value and importance of the link which binds India of the past to America of the future.—ED.]

The poem of Walt Whitman which its author declared to be the most revealingly autobiographical—to contain "most of the essential me"—is, curiously enough, not directly concerned with himself at all. But it came from the deep springs of his inspiration, too deep to be concerned with the merely personal. "Passage to India" is an occasional poem celebrating the opening of highways to "venerable Asia," one of the "ancestor continents" of America. In 1872 the first trans-continental railway was opened, a telegraphic cable was laid under the Pacific and the Suez Canal was completed. Since America had been discovered by Columbus in his search for a water route to Asia, Whitman looked upon the settlement and development of America as a by-product of the effort of the human race to complete the circumnavigation of the globe. When, therefore, following the explorations of hardy mariners, the engineers had effected one world, geographically speaking, he saw in the events he celebrated the promise of such a blending of races and religions, such an interchange of cultures, as would eventually produce a unified *human* world. For he shared the philosopher's dream of unity, the artist's dream of harmony, and the prophet's dream of brotherhood. "My spirit has passed in compassion and determination around the whole Earth," he declares, finding "brothers, sisters, lovers" in all lands.

Whitman's philosophical thinking was largely eclectic, and though he asserted that the basic purpose of his poetry was to found a modern religion consistent with modern science (evolution) and political democracy, the result was far from a consistent philosophical scheme—or even religious teachings on which could be based a shapely body of theological dogma. Nevertheless, his was a dynamic world outlook which made provision for the heart as well as the head, for faith as well as knowledge, and which sought the complete realization of the potentialities of the individual through a society which would exist, in the last analysis, to protect and cultivate values to be found in the individual soul.

In the creation of such a society he saw three necessary stages—at

least, in the United States. The first was the creation of political autonomy and liberty, which would guarantee self-development along lines dictated by the needs and the genius of the people. Secondly, there should be a harnessing of natural resources, the conquest of a continent by the rifle and axe of the pioneer, the invention of labour-saving machinery, the accumulation of wealth and its fair distribution, so that man might have leisure for the third and most important sort of liberty—that of the soul seeking culture. Of course, a few individual seekers after truth might, in almost any society, cultivate the garden of their souls by retiring in ascetic solitude to some Walden, like Thoreau; but to raise the spiritual level of what Whitman called the "divine average," social forces must come into play. In the third stage of this social evolution, the individual would become a citizen of a civilized world, for in cultural matters to hoard is to die and to share is to live. Through "democratic vistas" like these, Whitman caught such a vision of the future as to preserve his optimism even amidst plentiful evidence of men's greed and blindness.

For a person whose formal schooling ceased when he was twelve, Whitman managed to learn a good deal about world geography, history and literature. When *Leaves of Grass* was first published in 1855, Henry David Thoreau, calling upon the unique author, inquired if he had read the Indian classics. Thoreau had been struck by the similarities between Whitman's verse and the Hindu poems that later led Rabindranath Tagore to declare that Whitman alone among American poets had caught the spirit of Oriental mysticism. Whitman's reply to Thoreau's question was in the negative, yet late in life he affirmed that in preparing to write *Leaves of Grass* he had read the "mighty Hindoo poems." Certainly at some time he made acquaintance with them, either directly or through their profound influence upon American transcendentalists, for he quotes from the *Mahabharata* and he repeatedly refers to other Indian classics by name. More important, as we shall see, is the kinship of ideas between *Leaves of Grass* and those ancient poems. In his *Days with Walt Whitman*, Edward Carpenter more than forty years ago indicated parallels between *Leaves of Grass* and the *Upanishads*. Indian readers, likewise, have more than once noted this similarity between Whitman and Oriental thought, one going so far as to say that the principal poem of Whitman's first edition, now called "Song of Myself," is but an echo of the sayings of Krishna. Scholars have been studying this relationship, so that we now have something more than general impressions to explain why Whitman, poet of pioneers though he was, nevertheless tried to assimilate rather than reject the past; why he was conscious of himself and his nation as having signif-

icance only as links in an endless "chain of being," each "an acme of things accomplished, encloser of things to be"; and why he longed for the day when the Orient with its appreciation of the inner life would complement the Occident with its mastery of the physical environment. Nothing human was foreign to his poetic passion, and the good neighbourliness of his "*Salut au Monde*" is more than a grandiose gesture.

Professor Gay Wilson Allen published in 1946 a *Walt Whitman Handbook* in which he sought to relate Whitman to the main currents of world ideas. He finds him—however unconsciously—to be firmly rooted in such ideas, not merely democracy and the nineteenth-century belief in inevitable evolutionary progress, French and German romanticism and the new experimental science, but in Oriental and Quaker quietism, mysticism and pantheism or pan-psychism as well. One section of Allen's *Handbook*, that devoted to Whitman and India, is based largely upon an unpublished doctoral dissertation which I have had the pleasure of reading. It is by Dr. Dorothy Frederica Mercer (University of California, 1933) and deals with *Leaves of Grass* and the *Bhagavad Gita*. Emerson had humorously remarked, three-quarters of a century before, that *Leaves of Grass* was a mixture of the *Bhagavad Gita* and the *New York Herald*—meaning that its roots were in the mystic past of general ideas and rapt contemplation as well as in the Bergsonian stream of contemporary detailed experience, perhaps meaning also that it was in part literature and in part journalism. Dr. Mercer does not *prove* that Whitman had made any careful study of the *Bhagavad Gita* and she does point out differences between the two, such as Whitman's dynamism, his fondness, especially in the earlier poems, for sense experiences, his emphasis on the equality of the sexes, etc.; yet Whitman was a believer in comparative religion, a believer "with antecedents" in all that was vital and true in the cultures of the past, and hospitable to ideas from many sources. Frequently his ideas and mental attitudes have their analogues in Indian literature. True, though Whitman believed in the immortality of great ideas, he also believed that there is growth in the clarity of their statement and the range of their application. Though he praises Asia for its veneration of the old rather than the young hero in its literature, its emphasis on things accomplished rather than things promised, he is, with reference to the practical world, very youthful in his own outlook. "And on these areas of ours as on a stage," he wrote in 1872, "sooner or later something like an *éclaircissement* of all the past civilizations of Europe and Asia is probably to be evolved."

It may be noted that when Whitman thinks of Asia he has in mind primarily India and Palestine; he almost never mentions China or its

ancient culture; and when in 1860 he wrote a poem in celebration of the reception of the first Japanese ambassadors as harbingers of fruitful relations with the East, he quickly introduced India to stand for the world he would contact.

In the sources of his doctrine and in his influence, Whitman is one of the most international of poets. He is so human in his feeling, so cosmopolitan in his mature outlook, so charged with mystical faith in the essential oneness and harmony of the universe, a oneness that underlies its goodness and its evil, that he has been quoted by diverse groups for diverse, even contradictory, purposes; and he has been banned, when banned at all, chiefly by those who would curtail the freedom of the individual mind to seek truth and justice wherever they are to be found. When he was a young man he was in sympathy with the abortive revolutions which broke out all over Europe in 1848 in protest against tyrannical governments. It is said that the poem he wrote about it was later circulated by the Red Army when it was fighting the White Russians and the American Expeditionary Force. Even his *Leaves of Grass* was issued by the Russian Government at one time, in spite of the fact that his individualism is incompatible with totalitarianism. They welcomed his championship of the common man, but they naturally did not call attention to his warning against the regimentation of thought, a warning that applies to themselves as well as to the Tsars:—

> *Resist much, obey little,*
> Once unquestioning obedience,
> Once fully enslaved, no nation, state, city, of this earth ever afterwards resumes its liberty.

He was so jealous of the rights of individual States to manage their local affairs that he never advocated the use of the superior power of the nation even to eradicate Negro slavery in the Southern States, though for years he fought the institution with his pen. The support he gave the Federal Government and to Lincoln in the Civil War was due to his belief that the nation and the world must move toward unity and not toward fragmentation, and that the strength of a united nation was needed to guarantee the freedom of the individual. And when, like Tennyson, he dreamed of a "parliament of man, a federation of the world," it was because this might banish war and encourage the "communing" of all nations and peoples. In the United Nations programme he would today see the outward manifestation of a similar hope.

If we inquire what specific conceptions Whitman shared with the East, the most inclusive answer is that he believed in the unity of all life on the plane of the soul—not factual knowledge or even scientific truths so much as emotion, imagination and reason, as the transcendentalists used the word. To him the soul is immortal, but it comes to self-knowledge through contact with

the world of nature and of man. When he debated the subject with the American agnostic, Robert Ingersoll, it was not because personal immortality is a dogma of the Christian faith but because he believed he had attained a timeless existence himself:—

> I know I am deathless,
> I know this orbit of mine cannot be swept by a carpenter's compass,
> I know I shall not pass like a child's carlacue cut with a burnt stick at night.

He declared that life is the leavings of many deaths and asserted, "No doubt I have myself died ten thousand deaths." But this and other passages which have sometimes been quoted as evidence of Whitman's sharing the Indian belief in reincarnation may refer to the race of which he is exemplar and spokesman. It may be a poetizing of Darwin rather than an influence from the East, for, as is now universally recognized, his "I" is often a representative and cosmic one. But, if so, this only emphasizes his belief in the unity of the human race, to whose total past he recognizes his indebtedness, an indebtedness which each generation can discharge only by preserving and improving its heritage. He believed that the great religious leaders and thinkers of all times were more closely akin to each other than to the unenlightened of their own respective societies. This is because they share a life larger than their own—not merely Professor Woodberry's "race mind" but a "cosmic consciousness" which nullifies personal egotism by making the poet share all the privileges he claims and share, likewise, the misfortunes of all men, whom he considers as but kindred parts of that Whole of which he is a voice. Thus with him sympathy gives place to empathy, egotism to identification.

He sees life as serious and joyful for those who have learned to live by its immutable laws, and only by not "eluding" these laws can one rise above the frustrations and turmoil of selfish conflict and be untroubled by "the terrible doubt of appearances." Because the laws of cause and effect are never interrupted, he believes that "Everything that a man does or says is of consequence." Whitman's "Song of Prudence" and Emerson's essays on "Compensation" and "Fate" are not far removed from the Hindu idea of karma. But Whitman, unlike Emerson and unlike the Brahmins, relishes an experience for its own sake as for the residue of knowledge or insight it leaves. Thus he is the poet of the body as well as of the soul, for he thinks that mind and matter, good and evil, are, to the higher intelligence, related if not interdependent. Emerson's poem "Brahma" gave him none of the difficulty it presented to Emerson's Cambridge and Concord neighbours. Though he teaches that the great poet must learn self-denial if he would concentrate upon his task of building a bridge "between reality and the soul" of the reader, he is no ascetic; both in personal relations

and in prophetic message he is very social-minded. He does not see in pioneering, industry and an active life mere escapes from the problems of the inner life or a substitution of materialism for spiritualism, though he is aware of that danger for smaller minds and though his country's history has sometimes been so interpreted. Eugene O'Neill in his play, *Lazarus Laughed*, imagines the freedom from fear acquired by Lazarus of the Biblical story by reason of his death and almost immediate resurrection. Similarly Whitman, feeling that death is as natural a part of human growth as birth, and "even luckier," somehow acquires an Olympian peace and joy that has nothing to do with other persons or possessions. With his "foothold tenon'd and mortis'd in granite" of this sort, he can "laugh at what you call dissolution"—even the dissolution of human institutions, dogmas and organizations. The indestructible soul survives.

If there is ever to be One World in any more significant sense than a purely political (which is to say a pragmatic) one, its foundations must rest upon a faith in something as universal, as enduring and as sharable as Whitman's belief in man as a spiritual and social entity.

EMORY HOLLOWAY

WE HAVE COMMON PROBLEMS

"The Man-to-Man Way to Rebuild Europe," advocated by U. S. Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts in *Freedom and Union* for January 1948, points to the only practicable basis for building economic recovery and world order. A state-to-state, nation-to-nation basis, in which nations remain compartments, more or less water-tight, can never achieve "order, law and peace between the people of the democracies, and ultimately throughout the world." The constituent units of society, we maintain, are people, not peoples, and social reforms are nothing unless they are reforms of individuals.

Mr. Robert's thesis is that national generosity, loans from nations to nations, the "rich-uncle-poor-relation curse," is not the way.

Federal Union, through its common citizenship, he writes, makes "the economic problem of every citizen or group of citizens the common problem of all." But the Transatlantic Convention for which he calls would not be a step towards world unity, but only toward a world divided into larger blocks, with conflicting interests still. There is no effective formula for world unity that stops short of brotherhood between all members of the human family. This is implicit in Mr. Robert's own statement :—

> Brotherhood between man and man, equality before the law, a common voice in the promotion of the common welfare, is the cement which will hold the peoples of the nations together, and the only cement that can do it.

WHITE AND NEGRO RELATIONS IN THE MODERN WORLD

[**Dr. K. L. Little,** Lecturer in Anthropology at the London School of Economics and Political Science and the author of *Negroes in Britain,* deals here with a problem that is basic to the realisation and expression in practice of human brotherhood. How well justified he is in pointing to Brazil as the model for Western societies in this respect is fully borne out by two articles in our pages by Mr. Miller Watson, long a resident of that country. His valuable articles on the subject—"The Emergence of Harmony" and "Black Mothers' Day: A Study in Colour Prejudice"—appeared in THE ARYAN PATH for March 1936 and April 1937 respectively.—ED.]

One of the most important events in modern history, which has produced cultural and political effects of the greatest significance, is the dispersion of Negro people in the Western world. As a result of the European Slave Trade with Africa, a large proportion of the present inhabitants of North, Central and South America are of African origin. For example, there are some 13 million Negroes in the United States. Not only are whole areas, such as the Caribbean, peopled mainly by men, women, and children of Negroid stock; but, to a large extent, the great nations of the New World—the United States and Brazil—have been built up economically and industrially upon the labour of the Negro.

The Slave Trade was also responsible for bringing Negroes to Britain, though in a more indirect way, as the body-servants of home-coming West Indian planters. It is estimated that in 1770 there were some 20,000 in London alone. But the present Negro inhabitants of Britain have other antecedents. Quite a large number settled in England and Wales after World War I on their discharge from the army or from munitions factories. Others had served temporarily in the merchant navy. Most of these people came from the West Indies or from West Africa and they have made their homes in the seaport cities of Liverpool, Cardiff, South Shields, and Hull as well as London. They earn their living by going to sea as stokers and firemen. A smaller number of Negroes, who are also permanently resident in Britain, have jobs in the entertainments industry as actors and musicians: a few are doctors and lawyers and business men. The other important Negro section, whose presence is a temporary one, is that of the students. It comprises several hundreds of young men and women from practically all the British colonies in Africa and the West Indies. They study mostly in London, Cambridge, Oxford and Edinburgh.

The problem of relations between Negro and White people, in the areas thus briefly mentioned, varies greatly according to historical and other circumstances. There is the greatest possible contrast in the position of the Negro, and in attitudes towards the Negro, between, say, the United States and Brazil and other South American countries. His situation in Britain, though barely comparable with either, is intermediate in some respects.

The United States, for example, represents a country where Negro people have made more advance as a group and have attained a higher standard of living than any other Negro community in the world. It is also a country where the Negro is treated more brutally on occasion than in any other country. Lynching is far from being an extinct practice in some parts of the "Deep South"—the old slave States—where discriminations of every kind are stringently applied against the Negro. In the Northern States, however, prejudice is comparatively mild, and the various amendments to the American Constitution, which enjoin racial equality, are substantially observed. Segregation on racial lines remains, nevertheless, the key-note of American sentiment, if not policy. At the same time, the Negroes have succeeded in evolving a society of their own which runs parallel in all general respects with the White one. Its social classes correspond in habits of speech and dress to those of the White community, and Negroes run not only schools and colleges, scientific journals and newspapers, but also insurance companies and commercial concerns of their own. They are served largely by their own doctors and lawyers, organize their own labour unions and plan their own settlement schemes. In areas where intimidation is less rife, the political vote of the Negro is not without significance. Indeed, quite a large number of Negroes are better educated and economically more prosperous than many white Americans. It can be said that both in his customs and in his standards of living the Negro in the United States has more in common with the industrial and peasant communities of some European countries than, for example, with the colonial population of Africa.

At the other extreme, so far as policy is concerned, is Brazil. There, the national aim is "assimilation," and this is carried on irrespective of a person's colour or, if he is an immigrant, his previous nationality. It means that the Negro finds his place in Brazilian society on the basis of personal qualities rather than upon the basis of racial descent. Owing mainly to historical circumstances, the upper classes of Brazilian society are composed largely of "White" or lighter-skinned persons, and the lower classes of darker-skinned persons; but there are Negro people among the well-to-do as there are white people among the poorer sections. Discrimination exists, but it

is of a social and not of a racial kind, and apparently there is no restriction on the grounds of colour to prevent the free intercourse of White and Black. Men and women of mixed blood are among the main contributors to the artistic and literary life of the nation, and are numbered among its leading practitioners of law and medicine. In general, therefore, the position of the Negro in Brazil can be summed up by saying that it is with reference to the total community, not merely, as in the United States, to a racial section of it. The slave status which the Negro formerly held is not entirely forgotten, but it is rationalized in the remark that "a rich Negro is a white man, and a poor white man is a Negro!"

Historical factors also account for a great deal that is paradoxical in racial attitudes in Britain. There are, of course, absolutely no legal restrictions on Negro people in the British Isles, and this fact, coupled with official declarations as to racial equality, has tended to conceal the existence of a good deal of economic as well as social discrimination against coloured people.

The Negro student, for example, has quite often to overcome the prejudices of landladies and their *clientèle* when he looks for lodgings, and is sometimes excluded from a dance hall on the grounds of his colour. But, not surprisingly, it is the poorer class of Negro who has suffered most. This was particularly the case in the period between the wars, when the great slump in the shipping industry brought white and Negro seamen into fierce competition for jobs. Prior to this, at the end of World War I, there were racial riots in Cardiff and a number of other cities, and even today there is virtual segregation in the case of some of the seafaring communities mentioned above. Investigations carried out in Liverpool have shown that the Negro tenant not only lives in more over-crowded conditions than the white person of a similar class, but also pays a higher rent for his accommodation. Juvenile Employment Bureaux, too, in the same city, and in Cardiff, have frequently testified to the difficulties of obtaining work for young men and women of mixed blood. One report remarks that:—

> Little difficulty in their school-days is experienced as they (the coloured children) mix quite freely with the white children....It is when they leave school and desire to enter industry that the difficulties arise. The industrial problem is much more acute in relation to girls, for though the boys are not so easily placed as white boys, there is not the same prejudice shown to the coloured by male workers as by female workers....
>
> In regard to girls, the Committee are faced with a serious difficulty, as they are not usually acceptable in factories and there is only the poorest type of domestic service open to them.
>
> The difficulty is not with the employers, but with the white girls employed, who strongly object to the suggestion of the introduction of half-castes. It

is a very sad commentary on the Christian spirit shown, and indicates that the Colour Bar is still very strong in this country.

On the other hand, there are signs that White opinion in Britain has taken a more liberal turn since the recent War. This is due partly to recognition of the contribution which Negroes from the West Indies and other colonial countries made to the war-effort. Latterly, too, the British Government has given increased attention to problems of social and economic development in British Africa, and this has had its repercussions in fostering a certain amount of popular interest at home in the coloured peoples concerned.

It is noteworthy, also, that among more "progressive" circles, including the English student class, there is very little evidence of colour prejudice. English, Welsh and Scottish students, with few exceptions, mix freely with Africans and other non-Europeans. In recent years, a West Indian Negro has been elected President of the Union in Oxford—the most notable post in undergraduate life—and a West African student has captained the Oxford football eleven in the match against Cambridge University. Negroes hold, or have held, similar positions in the other British universities they attend, and the British team which competes in international athletics includes a number of Negro runners and jumpers. Even more recently, following a public petition, the British Board of Boxing Control abolished a colour-bar restriction in one of its titles.

In general, therefore, the prospects in Britain for a more amicable relationship between White and Negro people are good. Unlike many other parts of the world, where White and Negro groups are constantly in competition with each other for jobs and positions, there are very few factors of this kind to be obviated. Nor is the Negro population large enough to constitute anything in the nature of a real or imaginary threat to British institutions and ways of life. With improvements in the standard of education of the masses of English society, and with the rise in social prestige which will result from the political advance of the present colonial countries, most of the current objections to colour should vanish from the English scene. The British were the first European people to abolish the Slave Trade, and there is an opportunity for the same tradition of liberalism to lead other nations and countries to a still greater measure of interracial sympathy and understanding.

In this "global" world, as the late Wendell Willkie called it, the interdependence of White and Black is both unmistakable and unescapable. If the lesson, which Brazil appears to convey on a national level, can be learned and repeated more widely on an international scale, the problem will be solved. In racial matters, as elsewhere, the day of parochial politics is over. No longer is it possible to view the racial

difficulties of South Africa, of the British Empire, or of the United States, as if they were wholly of local concern. The economic, political and cultural obstacles they present require, it is true, the backing of local sentiment to enforce new legislation, provide methods of re-education, and establish fresh precedents. But the overcoming of such obstacles depends to an increasing extent upon the attitude and influence of outside agencies and interests, operating, sometimes, a thousand miles from the area affected. Problems of racial relations have become, in other words, problems of international relations. Upon a more universal recognition of this fact, and upon the readiness of governments to accept its implications and obligations, depends the harmonious outcome of Negro and White relations in the modern world.

K. L. LITTLE

THE INTERNATIONAL OF FREE MEN

Hungary's leading novelist, Lajos Zilahy's "Manifesto for Free Men" in the January *United Nations World* warns that if the world's free men continue in their cowardice and inactivity, these will bring them the fate they deserve.

The truly free man—the legendary figure who still clings to the words of Buddha, Jesus, Marcus Aurelius, Goethe, or Abraham Lincoln—is in great jeopardy today.

The free man is assailed by fanatics of the Right and of the Left, demanding that he make an open stand, suspecting his love of peace and his humanitarian leanings. The fanatics' loud denunciation of their opponents, abetted by the press which features crime and passes over in silence the normal life of millions, has undermined self-confidence, he claims, by giving men a distorted and false picture of themselves. The slaves to fanaticism are many; even "religion, science, literature and art have remained only partly free" of it; but all over the world, Mr. Zilahy believes,

behind the artificially created din of the minority is the moving silence of the masses. ... I do not wish to minimize the history-making power of fanaticism or even, in some cases, its good faith. But the fanatics must equally acknowledge the rights of the free man.

He holds it "beyond doubt that the greatest historic progress will come from the free man," but men who have kept free of the soul-fetters of party discipline need the assurance that they are not alone, especially the free men of Europe, "suffering from an increasing psychological poverty in this political and emotional crisis." "Free men alone have no international organisation," and what is needed, he seems to imply, is a spiritual movement willing to face the danger created by pessimism and mutual fear.

It isn't true that the world's material and spiritual resources are impoverished. It is up to the scientists to give us an objective view of our material resources and the outlook for peaceful planning. The world isn't made up of uranium deposits. There exist also vast reserves of men of good-will. Religion, literature and art must reveal to the world its spiritual resources.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCIENTISTS

AN INTERVIEW WITH PROF. M. S. VALLARTA

[When the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was set up by a Resolution of the General Assembly on January 24th, 1946, " to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters," its sixth Chairman was Mexico's representative on the Commission, Prof. Manuel S. Vallarta. Professor Vallarta, who was Professor of Physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (U. S. A.) from 1939 to 1946 and who has been since 1944 Research Professor of Physics of the National University of Mexico, came to India early this year as a Visiting Professor of the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, for lectures in his field of Cosmic Radiation, related to that of nuclear physics which had produced the atomic bomb. While he was in Bombay in February, a member of our staff sought his views on the moral responsibilities of scientists, a subject of pressing, even vital, importance at the present day.—ED.]

Professor Vallarta (Vayarta in Spanish, the language of his native Mexico) rose courteously from his desk in the tree-surrounded Tata Institute of Fundamental Research as his caller entered. A spare, keen-eyed, distinguished-looking man of middle age and medium height, Professor Vallarta has all the Spanish charm of manner and the fluent and accentless English natural to the son of an American mother who himself, moreover, had lived for many years in the United States.

He spoke first of " the very serious and very dangerous situation for the whole world " which exists due to the deadlock in the efforts to reach agreement on the method of atomic energy control. In June 1946 the United States and Russia had each submitted a proposal for the setting up of an International Atomic Energy Authority (or Agency, as the Soviet Union preferred to call it), which would be able to exercise control of atomic energy developments and to prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. These proposals had proved irreconcilable. The United States plan had called for the setting up, by a multilateral treaty, of an independent International Authority with full power to inspect atomic energy installations and to punish violations of the proposed regulations in all signatory countries ; and for the destruction of existing atomic bombs at a fixed stage in the proposed control schedule. The Russian plan had called for two treaties, one to outlaw the use of atomic bombs, just as gas warfare is outlawed today, and the other to establish the International Atomic Agency, to be under the jurisdiction of the Security Council, which would make its

decisions ultimately subject to the veto of the Great Powers. It had denied to the International Agency the unimpeded right of inspection and of punishment of violations; and it had demanded the immediate destruction of existing stocks of bombs. The American plan had received the assent of ten of the twelve nations represented on the Commission, but Russia and Poland had withheld their approval. The position has not changed essentially since the Commission drafted its first report in December 1946.

There were, of course, Professor Vallarta said, great possibilities if atomic energy was developed for constructive purposes, but scientists were not devoting their main efforts to peaceful applications, simply because of these political troubles. These interfered also with the free flow of scientific information among scientists all over the world, upon which the progress of science depended.

Asked whether the proposed Atomic Energy Authority would be effective without a strong and effective United Nations Organisation, Professor Vallarta said that the setting up of such an Authority would in itself be a considerable step in the right direction. It would to a large extent eliminate the possibility of another war, which was our chief worry. The scale of destruction in the next war would be very much greater than that in the last. As a consequence of that war we had 100,000,000 people hungry in the world today; what would be the effect of a war with a scale of destruction perhaps ten, fifteen, or even a hundred times greater?

As to the responsibilities of scientists in connection with the havoc wrought by atomic energy, Dr. Vallarta said that they really had not much to say about how their discoveries were used. "The scientist's function, as I understand it, is to discover a scientific truth. What use is made of his discovery is not for him to decide. He is not in a position to say 'This knowledge shall be used in this way or in that.' Newton discovered the fundamental mechanical laws that govern the motion of a ship or of an automobile, but those same laws govern the flight of a bullet or a projectile, uses which Newton could not have foreseen.

"Take the telephone. A host of scientific facts has gone into its construction, the way the telephone line is built and the way the voice is transmitted, so that you can hear in New York what is spoken in Bombay. The telephone can be misused. A crime can be planned over it. Can you blame the scientists who found the scientific facts that made the telephone possible?"

Modern scientists in many cases did not know that they were making or paving the way to the making of weapons of destruction. Pure science, the aim of which was the discovery of pure scientific truth, was not to be confused with the application of known scientific facts to definite ends, which was the field

of the engineer rather than of the scientist. Dr. Vallarta said that he was speaking as a scientist, not as an engineer. He knew nothing about engineers and could not speak for them.

He considered the question of whether a scientist was justified in putting himself unreservedly at the disposal of his government in time of war a very broad question. The scientist was not a disembodied man, but a human being and, as such, he had his feelings of patriotism as well as of humanitarianism. It was not a question to be dismissed in a few words; there was much to be said on both sides. It raised very deep issues, such as when a war was a just war, issues which he did not feel competent to discuss. Every scientist had to face them, the same as everybody else. The scientist had to do what he could to discharge his responsibilities.

Reminded of the policy in ancient India, to keep secret such knowledge as might be dangerous in ignorant or unprincipled hands, Dr. Vallarta believed that it would never work in the case of natural laws, since one could never say when they might be discovered by someone else. If, for example, Dr. Niels Bohr had not made known his discovery of the particular uranium atom that could be used for the release of atomic energy, it might have been made very shortly by somebody else—although possibly not. It was impossible to say. But the main facts had been known to many. The essential discoveries in connection with atomic energy had been made at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin in 1938-39 by three Germans, Strassmann, Frisch and Meitner.

In the past the scientist had lived in something like an ivory tower, completely independent of the rest of the world. He had now been shown beyond any doubt that that attitude could not be maintained. Professor Vallarta thought that, on the whole, scientists had been doing what they could to discharge their responsibilities since the war, and he would say also during the war. The widely publicised article by Dr. Urey in 1946, "I Am a Frightened Man," and articles by numerous other scientists went to prove that scientists today were very acutely aware of the situation and had done what they could to see that the public was accurately informed about it. After all, what influence they could wield was on a very moderate scale. In a population of, say, 100,000,000, there would be only 5,000 to 6,000 scientists. To blame the scientists for everything that had happened would be quite wrong. It was public opinion that, in the final analysis, was responsible in democratic countries. "In a democratic nation things do not happen without the expressed will of the people. At least, that is the theory."

Asked whether he considered experiments involving cruelty, for the sake of advancing knowledge, to be justifiable, Professor Vallarta said: "Fortunately, I have nothing to do

with any animal experimentation." He defended scientists in that field on the ground that the scientist was guided by only one consideration, the discovery of truth. If unfortunately, the experiment involved cruelty, it was his duty to see that it was as little as possible, though he had to look upon it as simply incidental to the attainment of his aim. Certain facts could be obtained only by using a living being. Aside from the benefits claimed for the discoveries in serum therapy, which his caller did not concede, there were the nutrition experiments on which knowledge of vitamins rested. These, he maintained justly, were sometimes no less cruel than vivisection, terminating, as they often did, in the death by slow starvation of the laboratory animals.

"Gandhiji would never have admitted that a means could be wrong and the end right."

"No question of that!" Dr. Vallarta exclaimed. "We cannot say that by doing wrong we can get right. We have to accept that as a fundamental rule for our code of conduct." But, as regarded vivisection, we had to weigh, against the cruelty involved, the necessity of that kind of an experiment to get certain knowledge with the possibility of remedying the ills of millions or of saving many lives. The individual scientist had to decide which was the more vital issue.

Asked what he thought India could do to help bring about a united world, Professor Vallarta said that almost the only thing the "Small Powers" could do was to help bring about harmony among the Big Powers. "They will be making a very vital contribution to the welfare of the world if they try to do that. They have so far tried to do so, but they have not always succeeded."

By "Small Powers" he did not imply only population. On that basis alone China and India were the world's biggest powers. Industrial strength also counted tremendously. The Big Powers today were the most highly industrialised nations.

"The trouble with the world today is that there is such a great unbalance between the tremendous advance, in the last fifty years, of the mathematical and the physical sciences on the one hand and the condition of our ethics on the other. Our ethics has not advanced at all. If ethics does not go together with industrial power, the result is terrible all around. We do not seem to be able either to use our ethical principles or to discover new ones to help us. India has a great deal to contribute along these lines. You might say that India is the one country today where these high ethical principles seem to count, to be placed in a decisive position."

Asked whether culture might not perhaps be a better measure of a nation's greatness than industrial development, Professor Vallarta said that he agreed fully in the sense that Indian ethics was claimed to be built on India's ancient culture. But

it was not simply culture; it was ethics that counted here. Culture and ethics did not always go together. "I believe that, if you are going to be able to straighten out the world's difficulties, thought must be placed upon high ethical principles, used concretely in concrete cases."

It was not enough, he considered, that India and China were pacifist in their fundamental inclinations. Everybody made professions of pacifism; he did not think that anybody consciously desired anything but peace, but then something else seemed to happen. "The thing we must try to do is to find some way that will really keep the peace of the world, forever if possible.

"It is unfortunately true that India is upset within herself at the present time, but just the same I believe that she has an extremely important rôle. It is very necessary that the Indian people should be kept fully apprised of the facts in the present situation, and that India should bring her moral influence to bear on it, so that some solution can be found."

MASS INDOCTRINATION IN RUSSIA

A telling case against regimentation is made by George C. Guins, who has lived in Russia, in his "Soviet Culture: Old Trends and New" in the recently received Autumn 1947 *Russian Review* (New York). The order was topsy-turvy in the "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité,*" that was the rallying-cry in the French Revolution, but experience has proved that liberty also is necessary. Though the pre-revolutionary upper classes in the Soviet Union were wiped out, actual inequality is claimed to be on the increase, while fraternity has become a formula for the absorption of adjacent countries.

The State has a monopoly of publishing-houses and art galleries and variety is lacking in life philosophies and in cultural developments

> since the life outlook, ethics, and the conception of progress spring from one source and are fed by the same prefabricated ideology.

The keying of culture and education to mass indoctrination has resulted in simplification, in quantitative gains at the expense of quality. The open mind, so necessary to cultural cross-fertilisation, is apparently lacking. "We are to teach the West, not *vice versa*" is given as the Communist Party's *leit-motif*. Indians' gratification at recent Soviet attention to their languages and their culture may be tempered by the report that

> the feeling of superiority of Soviet culture over those of the Eastern peoples permeates all writings dealing with the relationship of the Soviet Union with the countries of the East.

That Soviet orthodoxy is materialistic makes it no less of a menace to the freedom of the human mind and heart than the ecclesiastical orthodoxy of the creedal faiths, and no more tolerant than they are of differing conceptions of life and spiritual values. The exaggerated individualism of the West may, as charged, foster selfishness and greed, but these blemishes are no less hideous and certainly more menacing to peace when exhibited by a community or by a nation instead of by the individual.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

A PLEA FOR CULTURAL SYNTHESIS *

[This is a condensation of the review given orally and *ex tempore* by **Shri K. Guru Dutt**, Director of Food Supplies in Mysore State, before the Discussion Group of the Indian Institute of Culture, Bangalore, on December 25th, 1947.—ED.]

The Meeting of East and West is a profound study of modern problems. Professor Northrop, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University, has a remarkable background; he is widely travelled in Asia as well as in the West and almost as well posted in Oriental philosophy and culture as in his own Western subjects. He is, besides, a man of great sympathy and imagination. He has an almost uncanny understanding of China, but I think he has not grasped the differences between Chinese and Indian culture, although he has great liberality and unusual sympathy with Indian ideals and ways of thinking. His analysis of European problems, including in that term American problems also—not so much political as cultural problems affecting civilisation—his diagnosis of the main trends of thought in the past and his prognosis as to where they are going to lead are all very interesting.

The book is a development of one or two leading ideas. Professor Northrop believes that in man's experience there are two components, the theoretical and the æsthetic. The theoretical has a basis in everyday experience; from that you draw certain inferences and develop them into universal concepts. The theoretical component of man's mind has mathematics at one end and the applied sciences at the other. Man's æsthetic experience, he says, is unitary, but this does not mean that it is not differentiated. There is a continuum beneath, with something like waves on the surface. It is based on intuition, not on inference; it is immediate, final and concrete. It is your own, and you cannot communicate it, but can only give a very imperfect symbolic description of what you have experienced. If you are a poet, a musician or an artist, you may be able to convey it more satisfactorily than others.

From the time of the Greeks these components have worked at cross-purposes. The East has emphasised the æsthetic component. In the West the emphasis during the last centuries has been entirely on the theoretical. The result is a widening gulf between the ancient and the modern. Professor Northrop's main thesis is: If you can solve by synthesis this basic difference you will have bridged the gulf between East and West, and solved all cultural conflict.

Coming to practical matters, he was greatly impressed by what he saw in Mexico and also in China, but he knew that China was presenting only an old face to you and that New China was in the melting-pot. Mexico he considers a very good illustration of what

* *The Meeting of East and West.* By F. S. C. NORTHROP. (The Macmillan Co., New York. $6.00)

could be done by blending the theoretical and æsthetic components. The original Mexican Indian world, with all its background, has assimilated Western civilisation with its Christianity, and has given birth to a new culture, which combines the knowledge and also the æsthetic ideas of the great Aztec civilisation, with all that is best in Christian ways and thought. But he is very broad-minded; he does not propose a Mexican solution for other countries. Each should have its own, but should take from the others what it lacks culturally, and so conflict in the cultural world and therefore in the political and economic spheres will be eliminated. I do not think, however, that cultural synthesis can be so easily attained. We think the world is dominated by realistic forces, power politics, economic considerations, etc. Professor Northrop does not accept this but believes that the philosophic assumptions underlying cultures are what really matter.

The antithesis which he makes is between, on the one side, concepts by intuition and, on the other, concepts by postulation, called: universals. They are both important.

Professor Northrop challenges the artificial distinctions between appearances and reality.

> ...the æsthetic and emotional factors in man's nature, and in the nature of things, were designated as mere appearances and trivial; and the emotional æsthetic foods which the nature of man needs for its sustenance were deprecated and ignored.

The Greek and medieval Roman Catholic cultures, by separating these components, calling the æsthetic component evil and restricting trustworthy knowledge to the ancient theoretical component, made the cultures of East and West incompatible.

We now come to the comparison between Western and Eastern ways of thought. We have a habit of thinking of Western Science as positivistic, and of the Eastern way as metaphysical. He says the exact opposite is the truth; that Easterners have applied their minds directly to reality, and have based their cultural ideas on their immediate apprehension of Nature, while Science is based generally on a network of inferences, very far indeed from immediate experiences. "Max Planck was correct in maintaining that positivism, when conceived as a complete philosophy of science, would 'paralyze the progress of science.'" (I hope such a result will come off. I am medieval in most of my ways of thinking.)

> This positivistic character of the knowledge and culture of the Orient also accounts for a distinguishing characteristic of the Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist and Confucian religions. None of them in its uncorrupted form is theistic.

You can say God is That. Depart from this and there is at once room for a breaking of heads. And he makes the point that none of them worship a prophet. Some might think Buddhism an exception. But Buddha did not enjoin his worship nor is any salvation claimed through him. Then he tells us what exactly the æsthetic component stands for:—

> ...the spiritual, the ineffable, the emotionally moving, the æsthetically vivid—the stuff that dreams and sunsets and the fragrance of flowers are made of—is the immediate, purely factual portion of human nature and the nature of all things. This is the portion of human knowledge that can be known without recourse to inference and speculative hypotheses and deductive logic, and epistemic correlations, and rigorously controlled experiments. This we have and are in ourselves and in all

things, prior to all theory, before all speculation, with immediacy and hence with absolute certainty.

There is a defect in Western experience of this particular element, and before it can be restored, the West must take a page from Eastern thought. He has a beautiful description of what the æsthetic factor means in Eastern life and culture:—

> ...a factor which pacifies men, giving them a compassionate fellow-feeling not merely for other men but for all nature's creatures, and serving to keep them more at peace with each other, rather than to send them off on wild, impulsive, ill-considered and ill-grounded aggressive private, nationalistic or religious military escapades.

Coming to the aggressive—which Professor Northrop and Confucius call the shameless—attitude of theistic religions, he says: "To a follower of any one of the æsthetic non-theistic Eastern religions all this seems to be the antithesis of the religious spirit." This attitude to which he objects may not be inherent in the doctrine of any theistic religion, but the followers of theistic religions have not hesitated to express it. He speaks of what Christianity did in Mexico. When the original Aztec civilisation decayed from natural causes, the poor people believed that light would come from the East. They received the Spanish and how the Spanish treated Mexico is well known.

> Only an enemy of the Aztec culture could produce such terrible effects. This enemy appeared in two forms: the conquistador's sword and the Christian religion. Of the two the latter was the more devastating....
>
> Not until man's cherished beliefs are captured can his culture be destroyed. This evil aspect of our own highest moral ideals and religious values has been overlooked because in our blindness to ideals and values other than our own, we see only the new effects which our own provincial goods create and not the equally high values of the old culture which their coming has destroyed.

He speaks in another place of the effect of Christianity upon indigenous art. With the coming of Christianity to the Dutch East Indies, the whole cultural background disappeared. Professor Northrop quotes Marco Pallis who indicates in *Peaks and Lamas* that "the inroads of Western culture have destroyed the high æsthetic standards of traditional India and are fast corrupting those of Tibet."

> Each type of culture is already present in India; the theoretic component being represented in an early outmoded form by the theism of Mohammedan India as well as by the British from the West; the æsthetic component being present in part in Mohammedanism and unequivocally in Hindu and Buddhist India.

Professor Northrop says that India, like Kurukshetra, is the battle ground; if you solve these problems in India, you solve them for the rest of the world. He believes that Mohammedanism should temper its enthusiasm. These are passages—coming from a foreigner—which deserve attention.

He wants Mohammedanism to reform its militant theistic absolutism, thereby "making possible a peaceful mutual enrichment of Hindu and Mohammedan India."

He has a few helpful things to say about Hinduism and Buddhism also. He calls the caste system the bane of Hinduism. He says that it originated in an excellent principle, a hierarchy based on accessibility to Brahman, but with the passage of time that disappeared and people were Brahmans only by birth. He stresses that a man is a Brahman only if he has access to Brahma.

Professor Northrop gives some pictures of the Anglo-American soul, the product of a

philosophy of life which . . . so cuts man's soul off from the emotional, æsthetic and spiritual component of man's nature, that one becomes artificial, stereotyped, without individuality of the feelings, sentiments and imagination, afraid of one's emotions, tense, and often colourless or neurotic.

He contrasts with this the Spanish character, with its stress upon living dangerously. He has some significant remarks to make about the fall of France, how, torn between conflicting ideologies, it went to its downfall.

He analyses the idealistic background of the Communistic faith, but says that there is a flaw in the Marxist ideology and that unless Russia discovers this mistake and reforms, she is going to be a menace to the whole world. "The essential point in the error is the supposition that the negation of any theory or thesis gives one and only one antithesis, and one and only one attendant synthesis."

We have a tremendous amount of knowledge but we do not know values, Professor Northrop says. Here he places his finger on the weak spot in the modern cultural setting. He suggests that the Easterners will go to the West to acquire science, and the Westerners to the East to acquire their religion.

Whatever conflict there is between science and religion he thinks can be resolved by camouflaging religion and calling it art. But it is very dubitable if the whole world could be converted to a kind of weak, æsthetic religion—Art with a capital A. He believes that economics will take care of itself if you cultivate the humanities. The rational, scientific, inhuman way of thinking, though it has yielded many good things, has dehumanised us. That is a worthless pursuit which has no relation to man's nature.

There is no resolution of polarities. You cannot abolish them. They tried hard to have peace before the Mahabharata War. But no reconciliation was possible between Duryodhana and Dharmaraja. Duryodhana is the theoretical component and Dharmaraja the æsthetic. This modern conflict is very like the Mahabharata War; we have to fight it out and have done with it. Please remember, victory is on Dharmaraja's side, the side of Krishna.

Purusha and Prakriti were polarities recognised in India. The antithesis was solved by making Prakriti (Matter) subservient to Purusha (Spirit). Apart from Purusha, Prakriti had no meaning.

We have another duality, Shiva and Shakti. Shiva is the theoretical component and Shakti the æsthetic. They are on quite different planes, and it is the union of these which has been the glory of Indian thought and aspiration. We might think the religious life, the immediate apprehension of the Ineffable, to be in conflict with the practical life and its ideals and duties. No. The teaching of the *Gita* is to the contrary in unequivocal terms. You must have the two together. Krishna wants a man who stands up to his duties and "makes the best of both worlds." We can do that. We have forgotten it. We may yet regain it.

K. GURU DUTT

GOETHE AND THE NATIONS *

I have often felt a bitter sorrow at the thought of the German people, which is so estimable in the individual and so wrecthed in the collective. A comparison of the German people with other peoples arouses a painful feeling, which I try to overcome in every possible way; and in science and art I have found the wings with which one may raise oneself above it; for science and art belong to the world, and the barriers of nationality disappear before them.

These words might have been taken from an essay by Thomas Mann but they were uttered by Goethe, towards the end of the Napoleonic wars, when German nationalism ran high and the *Herr Geheimrat* in Weimar watched with uneasiness the heavy ideological clouds hanging over the German scene. Goethe not only refused to coquet with high-falutin patriotic phrases, but felt himself the witness of a new European development, an era of "world-literature," which, as the old Goethe understood it, is a mutual give and take, an important re-interpretation of the works of one nation by members of another. "Carlyle has written the life of Schiller"—Goethe remarked to Eckerman in 1827—"and has judged him everywhere in a manner not easily adopted by a German. On the other hand, we have a clear conception of Shakespeare and Byron, and perhaps know how to appreciate their merits better than the English themselves."

Whilst the aging sage of Weimar hinted at the idea of world-literature he did not elaborate it fully. His mind was not wont to systematize every idea. He more resembled a gardener planting his seeds with care and then trusting the good winds and soil to do the rest. It is thus one of the many merits of Fritz Strich's recent book on Goethe and world literature that, in addition to an authoritative analysis of Goethe's comments on this theme, it shows us their background on a broad canvas. This Swiss author surveys the blessings Goethe owed to foreign writers as well as the manifold reactions his work provoked in them. This is more than a fascinating chapter in comparative literary history; it also throws light on international relations, on the manner in which nations react to foreign influences and achievements.

To us the invigorating effect of Shakespeare on the young German poet, who hailed in him a fellow-creator, a guide to the truth about nature and history, is perhaps less astonishing than the sympathy with which he and the other bards of the German "Storm and Stress" movement welcomed the elegiac undertones in eighteenth-century English literature: Edward Young's melancholy *Night Thoughts*, the sentimental mournfulness in Macpherson's bogus *Ossian*. The *Weltschmerz* of Goethe's literary contemporaries, who, different from this son of a well-to-do patrician, came mostly from the lower middle classes, had sociological roots. They felt frustrated in the narrow frame of the petty states, snubbed by smug courtiers and exploited as tutors by haughty aristocratic families. As social life had few attractions for them, they escaped into such anarchical wish-dreams as Schiller's *Räuber* or into a tragic emotionalism of which Goethe's

* *Goethe und die Weltliteratur* (Goethe and World Literature). By FRITZ STRICH. (A. Francke A. G. Verlag, Bern, Switzerland.)

Werther was to become a symbol of European significance.

The overpowering reception accorded *Werther* is a phenomenon so far insufficiently explained. How could this Werther-fever catch even the cool Bonaparte as well as his passionate opponent Madame de Staël, and inspire half a dozen French novels of the class of Chateaubriand's *Renée* and Benjamin Constant's *Adolphe?* England was the exception. The country which was soon afterwards to ostracise Byron and Shelley had little time for Werther's morbid introversion. Professor Strich somewhat sketchily points to the firmly entrenched English political and social system which prevented the individual from any over-indulgence in subjective moods—the wider outlook possible for members of a nation, the wealth and power of which even antagonistic critics had to acknowledge, a system of social conventions which combined conformity with tolerance, and the Puritan legacy, laying emphasis on conduct rather than on feeling. These factors were unfavourable to an unlimited subjectivism. Even the depths of *Weltschmerz* are expressed very differently in English and German literature. Hamlet is sceptical, pessimistic, a man of the world, not afraid of facing facts. Faust on the other hand is consumed by his dynamic drive and largely ignores the world as it is. If the world collides with Faust's frantic search for truth and beauty, all the worse for the world!

Was it the narrowness of German provincialism together with the Lutheran doctrine of blind obedience to the secular authorities that drove the best German minds inward and prevented them from acquiring that balance between the inner man and man as a social being, achieved, however imperfectly, elsewhere in the West? Whilst Goethe himself overcame the passionate subjectivism of his early period and reached a balance of form and content, of reason and feeling, which made his work unique in German culture, the main trend of German writing remained untidily subjective, romantic, oblivious or contemptuous of social life. Though the German "Storm and Stress Movement" of the eighteenth century was fundamentally unpolitical, the very fact that it was subjective, unreal, revolutionary in a vague sense caused the leading English men of letters to regard it with suspicion. Southey and Wordsworth saw in Goethe even an enemy of society, of morals and religion. Coleridge refused to translate *Faust*, to him an immoral and pagan piece of work, written in vulgar and blasphemous language.

As so often in cultural history, understanding came from a small ostracised minority, who refused to conform to the established code. Shelley read *Faust* in the original and was more deeply moved by it than by any other work of fiction. Byron took *Faust* with him on his journeys, as Napoleon had taken *Werther*. *Manfred* is after all a *Faust*-like tragedy of a superman divided between the divine spark and the dust of annihilation. And was not its author himself another Faust, "tumbling from desire to enjoyment and thirsting in enjoyment for desire"?

Byron dedicated *Marino Faliero* to Goethe, who followed the career of the English rebel with sustained admiration. It seems Goethe identified himself with Byron to a large extent, seeing in him his own youth resuscitated

with its pangs and errors, but also with its brilliance and demoniac fervour. In Goethe's almost paternal pride there was a feeling of anxiety for a fellow-genius, who consumed himself in despair and lacked that self-restraint which to Goethe had long been a prerequisite of a harmonious and useful life. Goethe, in any case, understood Byron and set him a permanent literary monument in the figure of Euphorion, the son of the Northern romantic Faust and of Helena, that emblem of classical beauty. (*Faust*, Part II)

Professor Strich's comprehensive though occasionally heavy book contains much interesting material for an essay on Goethe as a literary diplomat. With his universal mind, this Minister of a small German Grand-duchy was also inclined to mediate in literature, to emphasize the points conflicting parties had in common. When he learned of the feud between the Italian Classicists and Romanticists he could see no real contradiction in their ideology and approved warmly of Manzoni, the leading Romantic poet, because he had never surrendered the spirit of the classics. Again, Goethe early recognised the necessity of bridge-building between the East and the West. The delightful poems in the *West-Oestlicher Divan*, of which an English translation is badly needed, are not only the expression of his interest in ancient Persian wisdom and poetry, but also of his belief that "Orient and Occident can no longer be separated."

Moreover, this great European welcomed too the pioneer-spirit of the New World, young, unburdened with decaying castles, literary quarrels and a cult of the past. At seventy he assured a young American visitor that he would sail for the States were he twenty years younger. America meant to him the future, as Europe meant the past. Both seemed indispensable. In the two parts of his novel *Wilhelm Meister*, people emigrate to the U.S.A. and re-emigrate to Europe, thus forming a link between the old tradition and the new social order.

Mediation meant to Goethe tolerance, but not mere *laissez faire*. His idea of tolerance, though far removed from any democratic meaning, was charged with social significance and inspired by belief in the basic unity of nations as well as in their infinite variety.

He wrote Carlyle in 1827: "A true general tolerance is safest to be achieved, if one takes the particular for granted, but sticks to the conviction that it marks the distinction of true merits that they belong to the whole of mankind."

E. K. BRAMSTEDT

Balzac. By STEFAN ZWEIG. Translated by WILLIAM AND DOROTHY ROSE. (Cassell and Co., Ltd., London. 21*s*.)

Since his early days in Vienna Stefan Zweig had been deeply interested in Balzac's writings and in the Balzac legend and for ten years before his death he had been working on a full-length biography which was to be his *magnum opus*. He did not live, however, to finish it, at least externally, although Mr. Richard Friedenthal, who has skilfully completed the process, writes that essentially the book had been finished. Certainly in the form in which it now appears there is nothing fragmentary. It tells the extraordinary story from beginning to end

with a sustained brilliance and an assured mastery of the facts. Zweig himself doubted whether it was possible to comprehend in his full stature such a gigantic figure as Balzac. Nor can his portrait be said to bring out the deeper meaning of a life which Henry Miller has called "the most stupid, aborted life that any intelligent man ever lived." But the facts which go far to justify such a judgment are presented with such a live sense of the torrential current which swept Balzac on that even the extravagant folly, the crazy ineptitude of his conduct in the actual world, has a certain monstrous greatness about it. No man ever condemned himself to a life of harder labour than Balzac. The one woman who really loved him disinterestedly wrote to him,—"A galley slave—that is what you will always be. You are crowding ten men's lives into one and burning yourself up in your greed. Your fate throughout your life will be that of Tantalus." And so it was. His obsession grew with the years and his only dream of escape from it was by finding a rich widow and marrying her, which was itself a material obsession that brought a final disillusionment.

It seems clear that the demon of frustration that drove him on and shattered the concord which should exist between the spiritual and physical man sprang from the inhuman treatment he suffered as a child both at his mother's hands and in the educational prison-house at Vendôme where he endured a six years' nightmare. He called his childhood "the most dreadful that has ever fallen to the lot of any man." As a result of it he developed, like the Louis Lambert of his most revealing novel, a kind of ravenous hunger that he was unable to quench, a hunger both of the imagination and of the senses. In a man of his volcanic genius, titanic will-power and inexhaustible energy, this hunger became a vast inflammation. Driven on by it he at once created and consumed his age, the age of a decadent civilization, in the great epic work of the *Comédie Humaine*. But, as his novels, *Louis Lambert* and *Seraphita*, show, it drove him also to conceive a world and a life beyond the social and the material, the world of mystical vision. It was his tragedy that these two worlds remained unreconciled for him, so that he was never really at home in either of them. And all his crazy extravagances and grotesque speculations, and the humilitating pursuit of high-born women, of which Zweig tells so vividly the tale, were rooted in the anguish of a lost spirit seeking the security of a home. Yet only a man of massive force, with a natural strength derived from his peasant ancestry, could have been at once so prodigal and so creative, so naïve and so material in his desires. In worldly matters he always, as Zweig writes, "stretched the bow too hard, with the result that it invariably snapped in his hands." But as a novelist his arrows found their mark. Zweig's biography is of the man rather than of the novelist. As such it exceeds in its incidents and dimensions the most sensational novel.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

INDIAN LITERATURE TODAY*

The First All-India Writers' Conference was held under the auspices of the P.E.N. All-India Centre at Jaipur in October 1945. One of the most valuable features of the meeting was the Symposium of modern Indian literatures; sixteen addresses were given by representatives of the leading languages. The presentation of these addresses in book form will, it is hoped, serve two purposes: It should make Indians in the several language areas better acquainted with each other's literary achievements, and more mutually sympathetic through the understanding of the problems common to all; and the composite picture that it furnishes should serve to introduce to the world of letters in general the chief aspects of the Indian literary renaissance, of which it is so lamentably ignorant at present.

The growth of the indigenous literatures is one of the most remarkable results of British rule. At the beginning of the nineteenth century they were at their lowest ebb; the great anarchy which had supervened on the downfall of the Mogul Empire had swept away almost every trace of culture, and the country lay at the mercy of lawless soldiers of fortune. Keshab Chandra Sen, speaking of his boyhood, says that the Hindu classics were known only in execrable translations into popular Bengali, which no respectable young man was supposed to read. Bengali was transformed into a literary language by the Serampore missionaries, who cut the first types and published the earliest dictionary in the language. Dr. Gilchrist of the Fort William College at Calcutta performed a similar office for Urdu, and earned for himself the title of "Father of Urdu Prose." A. K. Forbes, the author of that treasury of Rajput lore, *Ras Mala*, founded the Forbes Sabha for the encouragement of Gujarati, and "the flame of Telugu literature was just glimmering in the socket," when in 1824 it was resuscitated by the devotion of C. P. Brown of the Madras Civil Service.

The substitution of English for Persian as the official language of higher education in 1839 was a landmark. English literature was eagerly devoured and imitated by the upper classes in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, and Sir Walter Scott's novels were taken as models for similar productions, with Indian national heroes as their leading characters. Some of these, like H. N. Apte's romances of the days of Shivaji, or Nandshankar's *Karan Ghelo*, were works of considerable merit. Both of these, however, were eclipsed by Bankimchandra Chatterji, a novelist of real genius, who has furnished India with her national anthem, *Bande Mataram*.

Apart from the novel, the most remarkable result of the impact of the West has been the revival of one of the earliest of India's arts, the drama. The earlier modern dramas were mostly adaptations of Shakespeare but, in more recent times, the stage has been made the vehicle of social reform.

* *Indian Literatures of Today. A Symposium.* Edited by BHARATAN KUMARAPPA. (Published for the P.E.N. All-India Centre by the International Book House, Ltd., Bombay. Rs. 5/-)

Attacks upon child marriage, the degradation of widows and the joint family system have had a marked effect upon Hindu social life, and one result, especially in Western India, has been the emancipation of woman from many of the burdens which have so long kept her back. Modern India has, however, yet to produce her Bernard Shaw.

The Indian indigenous literature is still in its infancy, and, with the exception of Rabindranath Tagore and Muhammad Iqbal, modern India has hitherto produced no writer of international eminence. In the past, there has been too much reliance upon Western models, and these not always the best. Ethel M. Dell and Gilbert Frankau have been more popular than Aldous Huxley and Bernard Shaw. But, as this symposium shows, with the dawn of a new era, horizons are steadily widening. In Calcutta, the *Parichaya* group is trying to bring Bengali into touch with the more advanced literature of modern Europe, especially that of Russia. The most promising augury is the growth of a written literature in languages like Assamese, Maithila, Oriya and Sindhi, which cannot fail to have a beneficial effect on these more backward districts.

The most disappointing feature of the symposium is the scant attention which is paid to Indian writers in English. In view of the long connection between the two countries, it will be little short of a disaster if, under the new régime, English is neglected. Professor Sidhanta stresses the difficulty of making Indian characters speak naturally in English, and we all realize the artificiality of the work of Victorian novelists like Rudyard Kipling. But surely this has been to a great extent overcome by modern Indian writers; Mulk Raj Anand, for instance, presents a convincing picture of rustic life in the Punjab. How many thousands of English readers have taken their finest impressions of India from the gem-like lyrics of Sarojini Naidu! Jawaharlal Nehru, Aurobindo Ghose and Rabindra-Nath Tagore would be unknown in the West had they used their native tongues as the medium for expressing their ideas. If India is to take her place among the great nations of the world, it is essential that she should have a *lingua franca* which is understood by the West, and this must obviously be English. But that is not to say that the indigenous tongues should not be cultivated to the utmost, if only as a medium for the enlightenment of the masses.

H. G. RAWLINSON

William Blake: Selected Poems. With an Introduction by DENIS SAURAT. (John Westhouse (Publishers) Ltd., London, W.C. 2. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Rebel, anarchist, mystic, Blake stands alone in literature, an Ishmaelite yet a star—a single brilliant star with wayward flashes that no other star has shown. Of all English poets he has most baffled those who would pluck the heart out of his mystery. If intuitively they grasp the symbols on his gigantic canvas, they cannot explain them completely. A Vulcan among poets, he forges from his glowing imagination figures that awe by their stupendous vastness—Los, and Orc and Urizen, the strange and lovely Oothoon. He has no masters, no disciples. He is a difficult poet; yet he can be as

simple as a child. Hence Saurat in his Introduction to these Selected Poems quotes Verlaine: "*Quelque chose du cœur enfantin et subtil.*"

In his intense individualism Blake is astonishingly modern. He invents a new mythology; Joyce invents a new prose form. Surrealism would have found Blake its ardent exponent. But Saurat's anthology does not set forth Blake as symbolist or surrealist; he is chiefly concerned with Blake's achievement as a poet.

> Literature needs good material, no doubt, but it needs above all the mastery of the language, the form that we call art. The sound and the rhythm, the strength and the simplicity and the truth....And Blake reaches great art by his mastery of language, form and composition.

To most readers his shorter lyrics represent his best. Saurat places for us, side by side, the shorter lyrics and the passages from the longer poems where, as he claims, Blake reaches his highest peaks. Saurat has no patience with Los, Urizen and the rest because they rant in fustian—which to a sensitive critic is a sin the greater because in these desert passages here and there are lovely and powerful lines. But Blake sometimes attains exquisite purity and simplicity of form:—

> What is the price of Experience? Do men buy it for a song?

or the miracle of Mary and Joseph with its mediæval ring:—

> ...Mary answered: Art thou more pure
> Than thy Maker who forgiveth Sins and calls again her that is Lost?

"The nearer Blake comes to being a Christian the greater poet he is"; when he creates Theotormon and the rest he is merely playing truant. Saurat does not try to explain Blake's creations as other critics before him have attempted to do; he dismisses them. He stresses those other poems which give Blake a place with Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton—poems which reach the loftiest heights. Has Blake a message? He may help where Milton fails. We who belong to a generation of lost beliefs may learn much from Blake who is nearer to us than others of his Age. The way to a greater and more benevolent reality; how to reach simply and without subterfuges to the heart of our many problems—sex, for instance; to give artistic form to chaos; above all, to be fearless in thought. These, Saurat claims, Blake may teach us. But Blake can be an *enfant terrible;* we should be able to discriminate. "He is our *terrible warning*...." A thought-provoking Introduction!

Saurat has attempted to choose those passages where Blake attains the loftiest simplicity, to separate them from the "deleterious rubbish" that clogs much of his poetry. In doing this he has applied the only test possible—the purely literary. All that is best and most powerfully expressed in the "disciplined feet" of verse. Lovers of Blake may find one or two poems omitted that might well have been included but the Selections contain many of Blake's better known lyrics:

> I laid me down upon a bank
> Where love lay sleeping—

and several longer poems, especially "The Visions of the Daughters of Albion" with its strange symbolism, its compelling music:—

> For the soft soul of America, Oothoon, wandered in woe
> Along the vales of Leutha seeking flowers to comfort her....

Attractively bound, this new and beautiful edition of Blake will be welcomed by all who love his poetry.

> A very great poet, but, so often, a very bad poet. A child—and a nuisance—one in whose work it is more difficult to separate the chaff from the grain than in any other.

Saurat gives us the grain and it is a golden harvest.

KAMALA D. NAYAR

Current British Thought No. 1. With an Introduction by IVOR BROWN. (Nicholas Kaye, London. 21*s.*)

Every year periodicals publish some interesting and thoughtful matter, often quite as worth pondering over and keeping as a good book. But before we know where we are they have disappeared and we are confronted with a new number. Keeping pace with modern thought is a difficult job—the technical difficulty not being the least. I often try to get over this by cutting out articles to be read at leisure—which means either losing them or getting cluttered up with papers. Hence the current popularity of Digests—that is, condensations (though a good writer has already condensed himself). The publication under review performs the very welcome service of binding into a single volume complete pieces of more than passing interest which have appeared within the year. This volume covers thought in Great Britain, another covers the U. S. A., and the publishers plan to cover Continental Europe, the Far East, the Islamic world, and so on. Let us hope that so thorough a venture will be done thoroughly. That is, consecutively, so that we shall know where we are, and having procured and used this Number dealing with Great Britain, we can be sure that we will within a given space of time have a consecutive volume dealing also with Great Britain. This is asking a good deal. Less than this, while it would be interesting, would not be really *valuable.* But the publishers do not clearly indicate their intentions.

The present volume includes, not only articles, but, what is equally valuable, extracts from important books such as W. L. Sumner's "New Plants for Old" from his *Progress in Science;* Lawrence Hyde's "The Religion of Tomorrow" from his *Isis and Osiris;* and R. J. Cruikshank's "It Was a Hundred Years Ago" from his *Roaring Century.* I would like to be able to list the remaining thirty-five contributions, which include one from Bernard Shaw. They range from Aeronautics to Zoology.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

Zen Buddhism. By A. W. WATTS. (The Buddhist Society, London, W. C. I. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This pamphlet gives an excellent outline of Zen. Volumes have been written about this philosophy, but this pamphlet supplies the essence of it. One may read all the volumes referred to at the end, or, better still, live through a score of incarnations, gradually realising what Zen is. Best of all, one can gain that living moment, of which the author speaks; that enlightenment in a flash; and then volumes and incarnations alike become quite irrelevant. There is no need to seek for liberation, because in one of the Zen stories quoted "nobody has ever put us in bondage"; no need to struggle for Nirvana, because the very struggle creates the karma leading to intensified transmigration. Where Zen parts company with pure Buddhism is when the author claims it as the religion of warriors. But even in that respect, it is no farther from the benign and compassionate Buddha than most of the Christian Churches are removed from the Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount : just as far. Great praise to the author for his clear and concise summary of what Zen is (or appears to be) !

E. V. HAYES

Christian Prayer and Approach to Christian Mysticism. By W. Q. LASH. (Hind Kitabs, Ltd., Bombay. Re. 1/-).

These booklets explain in some detail theoretical and practical aspects of the Mystic Way. Mr. Lash in his seven lectures to mixed Indian audiences of Christians and Hindus has emphasized the assurances in the experiences of saints of the value of direct and intense practice of the presence of the Infinite. The mystics' testimony to God's existence tabernacled in flesh and blood among men, referred to by Mr. Lash, reminds one of the Hindu doctrine of incarnation. The author is right in holding that the goal of life is rest in God, but he has not entered into any philosophical analysis of the concept of final rest. Students of Hindu thought would find a striking account of that concept in the fourth Pada of the fourth Adhyaya of the *Vedanta Sutras*. His analysis of Prayer as recollection of the Father in Heaven, a sense of the unworthiness of the finite, confessions, etc., and his emphasis on the Grace of God in the mystic approach are unexceptionable. These are current coin in all theistic systems. The Mystic movement from the Dark Night into the Ecstatic Light, Joy and Fulfilment is clearly traced.

M. A. RUCKMINI

From Failure to Fulfilment: A Minister's Notebook on Psychological Method. By JOHN MARTIN. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Written primarily for ministers and social workers, after many years of practical psychological work, this might seem at first "just another book" on psychology, but when one begins to note down the "seed-ideas" that gradually give life and style to the writing, one comes to appreciate the common-sense balance of the outlook that endeavours to perceive life "whole," both spirit and matter.

Everyone takes from a subject what is consubstantial with himself. What the author has drawn from Christianity and from psychology shows a kindly sincerity of understanding, a grasp of the essentials of the problem, and an intuitive perception of the direction of the solution. The last would have been strengthened if the truth he gives in broad outline from the Christian New Testament could have been augmented by the Eastern teachings about the "psychology of soul," the "science of spirit." For they deal more comprehensively with the Christ potency in each man by whose light he may come to realise Divinity and Brotherhood. These the author also recognises, as the fundamentals of Christian values,—"the final fulfilment in the imperishable simplicity of 'God is love,'" and the fellowship, spiritual and material, of man,—though they really belong to religion itself, not to a religion. But, whatever the name, the truth is there.

His definitions of true "analysis," "transference," "suggestion," "persuasion," of "the therapy of action" and "sublimation" are all eminently sane and wise, as is his attitude to the use of hypnotism. The book should help to clarify the approach to problems, even if it can only touch the fringe of "fulfilment."

ELMA WHITEMAN

The Ancient Maya. By SYLVANUS GRISWOLD MORLEY. (Stanford University Press, Stanford University, Calif. $10.00; Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London. 55s.)

The great value of history is that it enables us to look back to the past and to stabilise points on the curve of progress, as well as to realise the extraordinary differences in modes of life during the passage of time. It also reminds us of the impermanence of much that we are tempted to regard as permanent. By the study of history we learn how soon the so-called marvels of our own age will be little more than dust on the pages of the world's story.

Of the brilliant civilisations of the past that rose to eminence and then fell, that developed by the ancient Maya peoples of southern Mexico and northern Central America was one of the most wonderful.

The known history of this remarkable race stretches back to the fourth century of the Christian era. The earliest records are inscriptions carved on stone monuments, which provide a chronological background of over twelve centuries. The Spanish conquerors destroyed the ancient empire with its religion, its customs and its way of life. The people were Christianised; the old age gradually merged into the new.

After the conquest, Spanish and educated Maya writers continued the story. Two centuries later an American traveller, J. L. Stephens, wrote two outstanding books on the Maya civilisation and in the nineteenth century English and American explorers added a large amount of new material.

Now we have the most comprehensive history of the Maya ever written. Dr. Sylvanus Morley has for more than forty years been exploring the jungles of Guatemala and Mexico. He has literally "dug out" much that was hitherto undiscovered. It was his work that brought to light the city of Uaxactun, containing some of the most ancient of all Maya monuments, and he has been instrumental in the restoration of the ruins of Yucatan.

The story he unfolds is amazing. In the linking up of the civilisation with modern life lies its most salient point, namely, that ancient Maya life was based exclusively upon the cultivation of maize or Indian corn, than which, as the author states, "nothing was of greater importance in ancient Maya life, nor indeed still is even today."

The work is complete, running to more than 500 pages, profusely illustrated by photographs, charts and statistical tables. It opens with a description of the land where the Maya live, their physical and psychological characteristics. Then follows the origin of their civilisation, its rise and decline, renaissance and conquest. The final sections deal with manners, customs and industries, ending with a comparison with other aboriginal American cultures.

Dr. Morley has good reason to be satisfied with his research. He has provided for the unlearned a strange and colourful history, and for students an exact and authoritative account for which they have long been waiting.

A. M. Low

The Letters of John Keats. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. (Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London. 21*s.*)

At a time when the volume is almost unobtainable even at second-hand, Mr. Buxton Forman's third edition of the *Letters* comes as a welcome gift in a drab and spiritless age. The nineteenth century accepted Keats as a marvellous, a precocious singer, but as little more: we know him as a thinker strangely profound for his youth, ahead of his time, who lived courageously and who can set a pattern for us in rising above frustration and despair.

> . . . to envisage circumstance, all calm,
> That is the top of sovereignty. . . .

This godlike serenity, of which only disease and death could rob Keats, was hardly-won through suffering. A fellow poet, a contemporary, one who had far less cause for plaint, could cry out, "I fall upon the thorns of life, I bleed." Keats, except when, knowing his end, he might be momentarily overcome by grief, could "journey to Italy as a soldier marches up to a battery," punning as he gasped in the foul air of the *Maria Crowther's* narrow cabin and as he lay quarantined in the Bay of Naples on an overcrowded ship. It was perhaps this humour, symbol of an inherent courage, which helped him to control of self and thought for others.

The essence of this fine nature, this rich mind, is distilled in his poetry, but in the letters there is an abundant overflow, careless and yet at the same time careful in literary expression, and written down in that strong characteristic hand all even tolerably familiar with it can recognise anywhere. These letters, meticulously and lovingly edited by two generations of Buxton Formans, are among the chief treasures of our language: any addition to them, however slight, is a boon. Mr. Forman gives us the actual text of the famous letter to Shelley (hitherto only in an imperfect transcription), and three notes, one to Thomas Monkhouse, the kinsman of Wordsworth, another to a Hampstead acquaintance and the third to Richard Abbey, Keat's thick-headed and not too scrupulous guardian.

It seems little short of a miracle that at this late date new letters of Keats can still emerge from hiding; but such was the personality of the man that even slight notes were kept and cherished. Is it too much to hope that one day a substantial addition may still be made—for instance, the letters to his early associate, the dearly loved William Haslam, his "oak friend" who, though in 1847 he could not put his hand on them, wrote to Lord Houghton, "They were probably so well, or intended to be so well taken care of, that every endeavour to lay my hand upon them has proved unavailing"; suggesting they were mislaid rather than destroyed?

The Oxford Press, surmounting the present difficulties, has given us a fine edition: altogether, in form and content, this new publication is an excellent guinea's worth. Editor and publisher have further paid tribute to Keats by enclosing a leaflet sent out by the Keats-Shelley Memorial Association appealing for funds to put its Memorial House in Rome on a sound financial basis after the disaster of war.

DOROTHY HEWLETT

Indian Flamingo. By CHARLES FABRI (Victor Gollancz, Ltd., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*); *So Many Hungers!* By BHABANI BHATTACHARYA. (Hind Kitabs, Ltd., Bombay. Rs. 7/8)

Dr. Fabri's interesting, if unconvincing, story is an essay on India's reactions to the impact of Western civilization. Sophisticated, Anglicized, frustrated India is no doubt an absorbing theme, but it doesn't lend itself to facile generalizations. This singular new Indian "caste" has a fissured soul, one part still obscurely sucking nourishment from the mother, India; the other pathetically, deliberately exiling itself to the adopted fatherland, the West. There are enacted, in consequence, many a tragedy and tragicomedy, and even many a farce. This fissure in the soul is a more wide-spread and more damaging phenomenon than the occasional, unusual mixed marriages and emotional entanglements on which Dr. Fabri builds his plot. A Hindu, Kishen Lal Mitra, married to an Englishwoman; his sister, Padma, in love with and loved in return by John Fawcett, a self-proclaimed "highbrow"; Saidullah, the Muslim scholar, and George Lindhurst, both John's friends, and both also in love with Padma: here we have a little too much loading of the dice! A set of nice people, no doubt, "highbrows" and all that sort of thing; and if there were really such a group of emancipated intellectuals, we might pass on with the Arnoldian exclamation, "What a set!" But somehow tragedy is forced into this Brave New World: Saidullah, brooding over his wife's infidelity and also over his hopeless passion for Padma, commits suicide; Padma's mother hits her savagely with her shoe (an altogether improbable occurrence); George, realizing that Padma is not for him, as good as commits suicide; and the way is at last clear for John, and he marries Padma, and so East meets West and never the twain shall part. Well, well, it's an interesting and ingenuous yarn, but let us claim nothing more for it.

Dr. Bhattacharya's theme, if anything, is even more ambitious than Dr. Fabri's. India during the war years —commencing with Neville Chamberlain's broadcast announcing England's entry into the war, careering through the mounting frustration of the next two or three years, and culminating in the cataclysmic "Quit India" and the Bengal agony of "so many hungers"— is indeed an epic theme, compounded of heroism and cowardice, sacrifice and selfishness; the stage is Bengal—India —the world itself; the actors are sundry individuals—resurgent India trying to shake off her fetters—Good and Evil struggling for mastery against a cosmic background. The story has thus to be patterned in divers planes and yet it has to be endowed with form and an integral unity. Dr. Bhattacharya's novel contains many vivid, excruciating scenes and also many familiar types—the war profiteer, the ruthless blacketeer, the fearless underground worker, the faded destitute heroine, the sex-starved white soldier. It suggests too the suffering, the heroism, the frustration, the hopes and despairs, of the harrowing war years. It is the human beings that fail to convince—as human beings.

K. R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR

The Three Crosses, A Study in Esoteric Christianity; Novalis, Pioneer of the Spirit; The Spirit of Literature. By POWELL SPRING. (The Orange Press, Winter Park, Florida; The Mitre Press, London).

These three volumes are Numbers II, III and IV in the "Human Science Series," and, the author being a follower of the late Dr. Rudolph Steiner, we take it that "Human Science" means Anthroposophy. In any event it is defined by the author in the introduction to *The Three Crosses* as dealing with the interrelationship of physical and spiritual factors in human life, and his thesis is that "the historical moment has arrived for us to consider man himself in connection with his physical environment." The Sacrifice of Calvary is, of course, treated properly as historical fact, but the symbolism of the two crosses of the two thieves is explained as representing the opposing "Luciferic" and "Ahrimanic" forces, respectively disintegrating and petrifying, which constantly seek to deflect man from the middle way to individual perfection. These forces are not to be regarded as unmitigated evil, or as forces having set themselves up in defiance of God, for from the former we derive the spiritual and creative faculy which enables us to surpass ourselves; while from the latter comes that force that prevents a premature spreading of the mental and spiritual wings of man, as it were, and directs our attention to the laws of nature and our relationship to the material.

The triune nature of man as body, soul and spirit (often called mind, soul and spirit by our author) is emphasised throughout, but the startling statement is made that "before the advent of Christ mankind could not be aware of the reality of the soul as a strong creative agent in possession of both freedom and responsibility for its acts." Again, Mr. Spring stresses all through his book the fact that Jesus and Christ are not the same, but that the latter took over the body of the former at the Baptism. Yet he quotes a passage from Steiner which says that "the event which has given the earth its meaning...consists in the passing of a God through the human destiny of birth and death."

Novalis, Pioneer of the Spirit, deals with the work of a German poet of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the friend of Hegel, Fichte, Schelling and Goethe. A good section of the book is devoted to an outline of the theory developed in *The Three Crosses*, Novalis' work being interpreted in the light of that theory, but Mr. Spring includes some representative writings, both prose and verse, translated by himself.

The Spirit of Literature, not unnaturally, develops the same theme on a wider basis. While we should be among the last in any way to detract from the immense value of literature, we are left with the feeling that our author is inclined to over-emphasise when he says that it "furnishes us with the only key to the wisdom of the ages," "can alone supply us with a yardstick for truth and error in human thinking" and "alone furnishes the key to both science and religion."

E. J. LANGFORD GARSTIN

CORRESPONDENCE

" REVOLUTION—EAST AND WEST "

I have reread Mr. Gordon Clough's article " Revolution—East and West " in the light of his note in the February issue of THE ARYAN PATH. I regret that, perhaps owing to my imperfect understanding of the English language, I had failed to understand correctly some of his observations. I fully accept the necessity of " individual aspiration " as explained in his note. Perhaps I have expressed the same idea in saying that the revolutionary must be " endowed with...a stern purpose in life. " I also agree that the refusal to accept defeat is essential in a revolutionary.

Regarding " organizations " it seems that Mr. Gordon Clough and I have discussed the subject from different angles. Perhaps Mr. Clough would agree if I put it thus: A continuous revolution presupposes that the members of an organization formed with that in view must be prepared to carry out without hesitation radical changes in their personal life and in the structure of their institutions as soon as it is perceived that the old practice and structure do not accord with the fundamental purpose and principles. The new orientation might take the shape of the dissolution of the old organization and the formation of a new one, or of the evolution of the old one in a new form. Gandhiji himself founded several large-scale organizations but did not hesitate to change their structure radically or even to dissolve them as soon as he considered such a step to be essential.

I thank Mr. Gordon Clough for his explanatory note and would like to assure him that even if I misunderstood his language I did not misunderstand his purpose. I would also like to repeat, as stated in the editorial note to my article, that in writing it I was expressing my personal views only and not attempting to interpret Gandhiji. There need be, therefore, no hesitation in arguing the matter frankly even with one " closely associated with Gandhiji for years. " There is hardly any expert on this subject, and I, for one, am not such—my reputation notwithstanding.

Both on my previous reading of Mr. Clough's article as well as now, however, an impression is left on my mind that there is something missing in Mr. Clough's presentment. I tried to trace it in my remarks, but it seems unsuccessfully. Apart from the linguistic difficulty, it is a subject which I can perhaps develop better in full personal discussions and when there is some concrete problem to be tackled.

K. G. MASHRUWALA

Bajajwadi, Wardha.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

The fact that so many of the country's leaders gathered at Wardha in mid-March, under the presidency of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, to discuss how Gandhiji's principles could be implemented is most encouraging and is in line with the suggestion in the March ARYAN PATH that Gandhiji's views ought to be studied, by those in power particularly, and the necessary action taken. Gandhiji could say with truth that his life was his message; and there was no more practical aspect of that living message than the obligation of applying truth perceived. Besides his example, however, Gandhiji has left a rich legacy in precepts, by which those who call themselves his followers ought to guide their steps. They are unfilial heirs who try to set aside a parent's will. We can fancy him saying, if time had been given him before he left us, such words for our consolation and our energisation as are recorded in the parting counsel of Gautama the Buddha, India's greatest son :—

> Murmur not because I leave you....The truth remains, the doctrine remains....ye must walk as I have commanded.

So far, with notable exceptions such as the stand against communalism, the governmental policy had not run altogether parallel to his teachings, as, for instance, in its encouragement of industrialisation. Gandhiji had said "Cottage industries." The Government had been saying also "Factories." He had said "Villages." The Government had been saying, in effect, "Cities." This, however, is not intended as an adverse criticism of the National Government under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, who is carrying the burden of an Atlas with commendable zeal and devotion. He sounded the right note *en route* to Wardha, when he told a Nagpur audience on March 12th that the choice before India was between the path of truth and honesty, which Gandhiji had set before us, and the path of deceit and treachery, which had brought successive disasters on the world. There were evils in the world, fraud, treachery and power politics, and India had great problems. The inspiration of Gandhiji's presence was no longer there, but by following his teachings India could be a great country in the councils of the world. The great need today was of unity and strength, and Pandit Nehru said that he had come to the conclusion that if Indians wanted to make their nation strong they must walk along the path chalked out by Mahatma Gandhi —the path of truth and honesty.

How many times has Gandhiji's judgment proved sound! India's bloodless attainment of her freedom is itself an instance. The wisdom of his insistence on the de-control of cloth is beginning to appear in some quarters, in the greater availability of fabrics and at lower prices. But there are other aspects of his teaching that need to be heeded for India to become the India

of his dreams.

We write before the results of the Wardha deliberations have been made known, but we hope that among the steps which it has been or will soon be decided to take are medical, penal and educational reforms.

The growing threat of medical orthodoxy to individual rights needs to be met. Compulsory vaccination, for example, ought to be abolished and those glamoured by that dangerous and cruel fetish of modern medicine allowed to resort to it only unurged and at their own risk. (Strong representations on this point, we understand, were made by the National Anti-Vaccination League, London, in a letter of November 25th, 1947, to the Indian Minister of Health, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.) Gandhiji's Nature Cure project ought to be developed on a wide scale and what he well called "the diabolical vivisection practised in European Schools of Medicine," which truly "no religion sanctions" ought to be made illegal in the country of the great apostle of *ahimsa*.

We should do away with capital punishment, that flagrant denial of Gandhiji's fundamental tenets, treat prisoners as human beings and make reformatories of our prisons. Needless litigation ought to be discouraged and peaceful compromise promoted in every possible way.

The villages need to be brought the opportunity of a broad culture related to life, and among all classes of our people there is need of fostering sympathy and tolerance.

There are other applications of Gandhiji's teachings that study of his many writings brings out, and which we hope have been decided on at Wardha.

The architect has gone, but he has left behind his blue prints. The materials too are ready, but will the builders prove faithful to the plans of Gandhiji?

The folly of India's patterning her institutions and her policies on Western models should be apparent to any reader of a striking article by W. G. Cove, M P., "Whither Western Civilisation?" in *The Bharat-Jyoti* of March 14th It is a gloomy picture that he paints, of wide-spread uncertainty, fear and anxiety, with war and the preparation for war still dominating individual and social life.

> And, let it be said without reservation, that the disease of moral and spiritual decay seems to be rampant in those nations whose technical efficiency is the highest....

Never in the world's history, Mr. Cove writes, has there been "such a calculated mass of cruelty as Western civilisation has witnessed"; sensibilities have been blunted by the horrors inflicted upon mankind, so that men have become inured to cruelty and the moral and emotional response to it is hopelessly inadequate. He quotes a telling statement by Dr. Fosdick on the present crisis:—

> Our enemies are not Alaric and his Goths pouring over the frontiers of the North. The enemies that threaten us are of our own creation, they are the techniques which we have ourselves perfected and which we have allowed to be perverted to unworthy ends.

The West has devoted itself largely to material ends and, man in his essential nature being something more than a material being, has inevitably failed to find permanent satisfaction in gadgets, which can never meet the wants of his higher nature. India, in her spiritual

heritage, has the preventive for herself of such a state as that to which the West has come and also the remedy to which the West is already beginning to turn. Shall she, ignoring that prescription, so recently brought again prominently to attention by Gandhiji, forfeit the chance for an integrated and well-balanced life for all her people by taking the very course that has brought the West to the brink of a precipice ?

Mr. Cove rightly thinks that education can make a powerful contribution to the bettering of conditions in the West, but it will not be sufficient to free teachers from the domination of Church and State bureaucracy, as he suggests. They must, as he writes, be "free to eschew the arrogant nationalisms of the modern world and both to imbibe and impart the international outlook that the technical achievements of the modern world demand for their fruitful application." But where is that true international outlook to be found but in a system of thought which presents the true nature of man and his relation to his fellows, that sets duties ahead of rights and that makes *being* rather than mere *doing* the criterion of human achievement ?

Among the countless memorial meetings since the assassination of Gandhiji, few can have been more impressive in their sincerity than was that held on February 10th at the Indian Institute of Culture at Basavangudi, Bangalore. As Rajadharmaprasakta T. Singaravelu Mudaliar, who presided, pointed out, that Institute is working to realise Gandhiji's vision of unity by "encouraging communion among minds," by giving ordinary, fairly educated minds a breadth of outlook resting solidly on the foundation of eternal verities, which do not belong exclusively to any age or clime, nation or creed; abiding principles only the application of which changes with time and circumstances.

An Englishman, a Muslim and two Hindus, one of Maharashtra, one of Karnatak, paid their tributes to Gandhiji who, as Shri D. V. Gundappa declared, represented the very soul of India's culture, had translated into practical life its highest philosophy and had demonstrated the art of finding peace in a life of intense activity.

He had proclaimed and demonstrated the supremacy of spiritual and moral values, the failure to realise which lay at the bottom of the frustration of our generation. It was the divisions made among men in the name of religion, that had put an end to the life of Gandhiji. This hatred and the failure to recognise the essential brotherhood of our common humanity had to be fought.

Prof. N. A. Nikam said that the Power that was in Gandhiji had brought us together as never before. That Power had descended upon those who loved him, laying upon them a Duty, which Prof. Marcus Ward defined as the transmuting of the great grief and shock which each had felt into a higher dedication and a more determined purpose. Gandhiji was, Professor Ward declared, among those who from time to time had saved humanity by relating life to new values and transforming it. They "took a dark day and used it as a telescope to the shining stars." Just before Gandhiji was slain, Pandit Nehru had proclaimed his faith that there was something godlike in man, and that in the end the godlike and the good would prevail. It is for us to

justify that supreme spiritual principle for which Gandhiji himself had lived and died.

Mr. K. Habibullah Khan said that it was a potent symbol that the Jumna and the Ganges, representing, the one, the grandeur of the departed Mogul Empire, and the other, the spirit of Hinduism, were to receive the major portion of the ashes of his bodily remains.

Shri Mudaliar pointed out the hopeful change already evident since Gandhiji's death in the attitude towards religious organisations. If we built up a nation without communal barriers we should have helped to justify our belonging to his generation.

In the Resolution passed the meeting

> expresses its profound grief and sense of incalculable loss, suffered by India in common with the whole world, at the passing of Mahatma Gandhi, the most authentic voice in our time of the rich moral and spiritual culture of this ancient land, and the noblest exponent of the message of the universal humanism. The meeting feels no doubt that the world will ever cherish his inspiring memory with gratitude in its heart, and translate his great teachings into terms of pure Dharma in individual and social life, and of fellow-feeling in inter-class, inter-communal, inter-racial and international relationships.

Dr. L. P. Jacks, world-known educational, religious and social reformer and our valued contributor, who has retired after forty-five years' editorship of the *Hibbert Journal*, is paid deservedly high tributes in its January issue. He has, in the words of an address from the Hibbert Trustees and others, "pursued fearlessly a way of thought which, while never flinching from rational and scientific criticism, has never lost hold of the duty of reverence for that which deserves reverence and of awe in the presence of the ultimate mystery."

The Very Rev. W. R. Inge mentions in his tribute Dr. Jacks's ideal "that all who love God with sincerity should come together in an invisible Church" and adds:—

> Of late years he has recognised that this community must include the mystics and religious philosophers of India, from whom we have something to learn, as they have something to learn from us.

This is perhaps not unrelated to Dr. Jacks's generous sympathy with the efforts of THE ARYAN PATH, to which he has contributed a number of valuable articles and reviews. In our first volume he expressed his faith in the presence in every normal human being of a latent power which, once awakened, could "accomplish the most astonishing results." This latent power he called "the passion for excellence" and he regarded its awakening as the primary object of education at all stages.

One of Dr. Jacks's most stimulating articles, "Training the Hand: Creativeness in Education," in which he stressed the soul's craving to create beauty alongside its need for goodness and for truth, appeared in THE ARYAN PATH for May 1938.

In "The World Is One: Politics and an Alternative," in our May 1936 issue, he wrote that "the change of mind and heart needed to establish universal brotherhood" could only come about through moral regeneration. Hence the necessity for

> steady, patient and long-continued effort to improve the quality of the human material, of the men and women, who form the living substance of society.

That end his *Hibbert Journal* and his books—*The Alchemy of Thought, A Living Universe, The Education of the Whole Man* and many more—have served and his labours have indeed, as Mr. J. W. Robertson Scott writes in his tribute, "left their mark on the times."